STUDIA HISTORICA ET PHILOLOGICA XII

SECTIO SLAVICA

4

PRINCE ANDREJ BOGOLJUBSKIJ: THE MAN AND THE MYTH

ELLEN S. HURWITZ
Lafayette College

LICOSA EDITRICE - FIRENZE 1980

Contents

Preface

This is a book about a twelfth-century Russian prince, little known in the West, but recognized even today in the Soviet Union as an important and fascinating ruler. His name was Andrej Jur'evič Boguljubskij — Andrew, son of George, the God-loving. He reigned from the town of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma in the Volga-Oka River valley, where a few centuries later Moscow would become a major imperial power base. Indeed, he was the first of his princely line to rule from this region. His predecessors reigned from Kiev, some five hundred miles to the south and west. More than any other individual, Prince Andrej was responsible for transferring the power base of Russia from Kiev to the area which would from his time forward be the most critical locus of princely, then tsarist power.

That few volumes pertaining to the earliest phases of Russian history have appeared in the West, and none at all on the twelfth century, is in this author's view a veritable sadness. To be sure, our sources are scanty and oftentimes drastically falsified. It is nevertheless essential to an understanding of Russia's more recent history that we probe her remoter past.

Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij provided the historian ample opportunity for inquiry. He was a prince highly conscious of his mission who arranged that literary and architectural monuments be erected to immortalize his memory. He was a remarkably dramatic individual whose actions color the major chronicles of his day. Sources do not abound, of course, but we have enough to describe what Prince Andrej set out to achieve, what he in fact accomplished, and how his efforts were perceived by friends and enemies alike. We can present, in other words, a political biography of a twelfth-century Russian prince.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank all those who took the time to read my manuscript in its various stages of preparedness. I am especially grateful to the late Michael Cherniavsky, to John Fennell of Oxford University, to Andrzej Kaminski of Columbia University, and, above all others, to Ihor Ševčenko of Harvard University.

I acknowledge my debt as well to the Inter-University Committee on Travel, to the National Endowment for the Humanities and to Lafayette College for helping to underwrite research expenses in the Soviet Union and in the United States.

Abbreviations

C.S.H.B	*Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae.* Bonn, 1828–97.
Cross	S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *The Russian Primary Chronicle, Laurentian Text.* Cambridge, Mass., 1953.
Zodčestvo	N. N. Voronin, *Zodčestvo severo-vostočnoj Rusi XII–XV vekov* I. Moscow, 1961.
L.	Leningrad
M.	Moscow
Paterik	*Paterik Kievo-Pečerskogo Monastyrja.* Edited by D. Abramovic, *Pamjatniki slavjano-russkoj pis'mennosti.* St. Petersburg, 1908, repr. Munich, 1964.
P.S.R.L.	*Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*
P.S.R.L. I	*Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej* I: *The Laurentian Chronicle* (2nd ed. Leningrad, 1926, repr. 1962).
P.S.R.L. II	*Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej* II: *The Hypatian Chronicle* (3rd ed. Petrograd, 1923, repr. 1962).
"Skazanie o čudesax"	V. O. Ključevskij (ed.), *Skazanie o čudesax vladimirskoj ikony božiej materi, Čtenija Obščestva Ljubitelej Drevnej Pis'mennosti,* no. 30 (1878).
T.O.D.R.L.	*Trudy otdela drevne-russkoj literatury*
Viz. vrem.	*Vizantijskij vremennik*

I

The Quest to Rule *Rus'*

From his headquarters in the Rostov Land Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij ruled *Rus'*. His success was brief and only partial, but the intensity of his effort marks him as one of early Russia's most outstanding political figures.

a. Kiev and Rostov Before Andrej's Rule

When Andrej became Prince of the Rostov Land in 1157 he assumed control over a region which had experienced several centuries of relations with Kiev and with Novgorod. Information on the early history of the region is scant and at times very vague,[1] but it is clear that civilization in the fertile valley between the Volga and the Oka Rivers preceded the appearance there of Bogoljubskij and his entourage of Kievan clergy.[2] Archaeological data indicate the existence of fairly developed agricultural settlements in that area as early as the ninth century.[3] The *Primary Chronicle* states that prior to Rjurik's occupation of *Rus'*, the region was inhabited by Finnish peoples and that Slavs arrived there shortly thereafter.[4] Toponymic data confirm the existence of Slavic settlements in the region from as early as the ninth century.[5]

Rostov was the first Slavic settlement to attract the attention of Kievan rulers. According to the *Primary Chronicle* Rjurik himself placed a subordinate in Rostov together with "Varangian colonists."[6] In 882, that *Chronicle* states, Prince Oleg established towns in the area and introduced the collection of the tribute[7] which was soon to become vital to the existence of Kiev. By 907 one of the princes directly subordinate to Oleg resided in Rostov.[8] From 988 a son of the grand prince of Kiev was regularly awarded jurisdiction over the territory which had Rostov as its center. In that year Vladimir Svjatoslavič sent Jaroslav the Wise to Rostov[9] and, shortly thereafter, Jaroslav's brother Boris, the original possessor of the sword which might have saved Andrej Bogoljubskij's life.[10]

Jaroslav strengthened ties between Rostov and its eastern neighbor

reign of Andrej Bogoljubskij, who, in their view, anticipated the destiny of Muscovy when he loosed himself from the shackles of the Kievan past. Whereas contemporary accounts of the reign suggest a time of ambivalence and ambiguity characteristic of most transitional periods, Muscovite renditions transform the reign into the first clear-cut autocracy of the northeast. Particularly telling examples of this transformation can be found in the *Nikon Chronicle*[5] and the *Book of the Generations of the Tsar's Genealogy* (*Stepennaja kniga*),[6] both creations of the sixteenth century. The *Book of the Generations* stresses Andrej's translation of an icon of the Virgin from Vyšegorod to Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma, in 1157. The translation anticipates the moving of the icon's quarters from Vladimir to Moscow in 1395 by order of Vasilij Dmitrievič.[7] The *Laurentian Chronicle* (1377) and the *Hypatian Chronicle* discuss the translation of the icon, the subject as well of an ideological tract composed during Andrej's reign, and clearly provide the inspiration for the later accounts.[8] But later chronicles embellish the story: whereas early versions relate that Andrej discovered the icon in Vyšegorod after it was ordered there from Tsargrad (Constantinople) by an unknown person, the *L'vov Chronicle* reports that Andrej himself ordered the icon to be brought from Tsargrad;[9] others allege that the Evangelist Luke himself painted it.[10] The *Nikon Chronicle* suggests, moreover, that Andrej was the friend of the Patriarch and of the Emperor of Constantinople, who sent him substantial gifts.[11]

In addition to fabricating amicable relations with Byzantium, an inclination present already in Andrej's own time,[12] Muscovite chronicles transformed the Prince's appetite for power into a titular reality. The *Hypatian Chronicle* states simply that Andrej wished to be "autocrat" (*samovlastec'*); later chronicles called him "monocrat" (*edinoderžatel'*)[13] and describe him as "autocratic" (*samoderž'stvujaj*).[14] And whereas the early chronicles called him "prince," with the sole exception of a single posthumous reference to him as "grand prince,"[15] later accounts recognized Andrej's status as "grand prince" from his accession in 1158.[16] They also called the territory which he ruled a "grand principality,"[17] whereas their Kievan sources always called it a "land." The *Book of the Generations* specifically states that "already at that time the Kievan grand princes [there were, allegedly, many, just as there were in the fourteenth century!] were subservient to the Vladimir *samoderžec'*."[18] Finally, the epithets and descriptive titles affixed to Andrej's name suggest the hieratic posture of his Muscovite successors: for example, "well-crowned" (*blagovenčannyj*)[19] and "the Lord's annointed" (*pomazannik' božij*),[20] compliments never paid the Prince by earlier chroniclers. Thus, according to Muscovite sources Andrej Bogoljubskij was the

prototype of the Muscovite tsars, recognized by emperors and princely underlings alike as a powerful, sacred, grand prince of a thriving, new grand principality.

Andrej's contributions to the rise of Moscow assume a particularly imaginative twist in the seventeenth century *Tale of the Founding of Moscow* (*Povest' o začale Moskvy*). According to one version of the *Tale* Andrej refused to share his bed with his alleged wife Ulita Kučkova (the sister of one of the real murderers of Prince Andrej), and the frustrated spouse incited her brothers to hack the abstemious prince to death. Andrej died a martyr's death, not, as we read in the original accounts of his demise, because he fell victim to a political murder in the traditions of the sons of St. Vladimir, Boris and Gleb, but because the bloodbath he suffered suggested the sanguine origins of the First and Second Romes. Rome and Constantinople were built, the author maintains, on the bloody sufferings of many victims. The Prince's murder was the necessary prerequisite for the rise of Moscow the Third Rome. Andrej, the monkish ascetic who abstained from sexual relations with his wife, displayed steadfast resistance to the carnal pleasures, as if sensing his holy mission. In this *Tale* Andrej died that Moscow could be born.[21]

If the Muscovite mythologists minimized Andrej's Kievan roots, their modern successors, who took them for their guides, compounded the error. They developed the theory of the spontaneous generation of the Muscovite state and totally ignored the antecedents to our Prince's quest for translation. He came to be seen as the sole mover of Russian history from the Kievan to the Muscovite eras. The origin was spontaneous and unadulterated, as if no predecessors sensed the need to develop lands to the north and east of the Ukraine. M. P. Pogodin wrote a biography of the Prince in 1850. He credits his hero with the introduction into history of the Great Russians — that inspired combination of Eastern Slav (coming from the south) and Finn which allegedly came to pass during Andrej's reign. Andrej was a "second Rjurik," the discoverer of the Upper Volga, the homeland of Muscovite tsardom.[22] Referring to Andrej's exodus from the south in 1155, S. M. Solov'ev echoed Pogodin when he claimed that "The north began its historical life when its Prince [Andrej] took the step in the direction of a new order."[23] The new order affirmed the right of the prince as an individual, apart from his kinsmen, to own the property which he developed and civilized. This individual ownership marked the end of the "clan life-style" (*rodovoj byt*) and the beginning of the "state life-style" (*gosudarstvennyj byt*).[24] Andrej's quest for *samovlastie* was a quest for absolute power in the spirit of the sixteenth century autocracy.[25] Respon-

sible for the greatest wave of emigration from southern *Rus'* to the upper Volga, he shifted the course of history almost singly. Once in the northeast, Solov'ev argued, these Slavs forgot their origins: they intermingled with the local, savage Finns and a new people was formed in a virgin and idle area. In this atmosphere, unencumbered by a political past, a totally new type of government came to pass.[26]

V. O. Ključevskij echoed Pogodin and Solov'ev. Andrej, he claimed, introduced a new historical era, the appanage (*udel'nyj*) era, in the savage lands of Rostov, which came to life before the Prince's eyes.[27] He was a "Muscovite type of ruler who now replaced his Kievan prototype,"[28] a Prince who had a "habit of constantly looking to the future"[29] and a "faculty of producing order out of chaos."[30] He was the first prince to substitute for "the old, indefinite voluntary system of princely relations based upon kinship . . . an obligatory subordination of the junior members of the princely house to the senior member."[31] Indeed, Ključevskij stated, "the whole figure of this ruler breathed the spirit of innovation."[32]

Ključevskij's opinions were shared by the ecclesiastical historian V. Georgjevskij who, in 1895, wrote *The Holy, Pious Grand Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij: His Invaluable Services to the Russian State and to the Orthodox Church*. In this monograph Georgjevskij maintained that Andrej lay the foundation for the Muscovite unity of autocracy and Orthodoxy.[33]

Soviet historians have begun to question the myths of spontaneous generation and prototypic autocracy. In 1918 A. E. Presnjakov exposed the shortcomings of the picture drawn by his predecessors and asserted that no evidence whatsoever leads to the conclusion either that Bogoljubskij was particularly Muscovite or that the Rostov Land of his day was a savage, uncivilized territory. The so-called "new order" introduced by that Rjurik of the Upper Volga was not so new; the Suzdal' bojars were as supportive or hostile as the upper classes of the other lands of twelfth-century *Rus'*.[34] Andrej executed his policies "on the basis of a firmly established way of life . . . in the context of the same general situation that we find at that time in Kiev, Volhynia, Galicia and Černigov."[35] Other princes before and during Andrej's reign conducted themselves according to "the age-old concept of the senior prince ruling in his father's place."[36] Andrej's arrival in Rostov, Suzdal', and Vladimir, Presnjakov added, did not mark the beginning of civilization in that region. The affirmation of a well-established hereditary princely rule there presupposed substantial colonization in the past.[37] Moreover, "by itself the ecclesiastical architecture [of twelfth-century Vladimir-

Suzdal'] is sufficient cause to reject the notion that northeastern Russia in the twelfth century was a dark and primitive country."[38]

Presnjakov's challenge to traditional historiography on the origins of the Muscovite state encouraged his successors to take a fresh look at the evidence on Andrej's political behavior and the status of the Rostov Land at the time of his rule. In 1929 M. K. Ljubavskij confirmed Presnjakov's suspicions that the migration of Slavs to the Upper Volga valley antedated Andrej's reign by as much as several centuries.[39] Other Soviet historians, including M. N. Tixomirov[40] and N. N. Voronin,[41] examined the many indications of culture in the northeast at least from the eleventh century. In 1956 S. M. Kaštanov articulated what had come to be the official view:[42]

> In our view the politics of the Vladimir-Suzdal' princes of the twelfth century . . . should in no way be considered a prologue to the centralist politics of the fourteenth and fifteenth century Muscovite princes. Rather they must be associated with a number of final efforts to establish a unified government which, as the activities of Monomax indicate, could take place in the circumstances of the beginning of feudal disintegration.

Similarly, I. Ju. Budovnic regarded the reign as representative of the period of feudal disintegration.[43] And B. D. Grekov stated that Andrej ". . . was no exception, but one of the more striking illustrations of an order of things which entailed changes in the superstructure under the impact of changes in the base."[44]

Yet a portion of the old mystique is still current among Soviet historians. Although a product of the period of "feudal disintegration," Andrej has managed to retain some aspects of his more venerable role as precursor of Muscovy. According to Grekov, "Andrej displayed certain traits which make him akin to future Muscovite statesmen."[45] Budovnic claimed that Andrej based his power on "new social forces" and that his "domestic policies departed from established traditions."[46] B. A. Rybakov lacks discrimination in his use of chronicle evidence concerning Andrej. He credits the Prince with the fortification of Moscow because the sixteenth-century *Tver Chronicle*, a document of dubious reliability for the period in question, claims that Jurij, Andrej's father, fortified Moscow in 1156 when in fact we know from other sources that he was in Kiev at that time.[47] Rybakov claims that Andrej was an "autocratic" prince who had the unusual intelligence not to divide up his patrimony among his sons.[48] He seems to forget that in fact most of Andrej's male offspring predeceased him.

One damaging result of the remnants of the Bogoljubskij myth in present

Soviet scholarship is the inability to appreciate the impact of Kiev on Andrej's reign. This scholarship tends to interpret the reign as a totally new phenomenon, be it Muscovite autocracy or feudal disintegration, leading to a minimization, if not virtual disregard of Kiev's hold on Andrej. Thus modern Soviet historians, like their nineteenth-century predecessors, turn their backs on what I regard as one of the determining factors in Andrej Bogoljubskij's political behavior.

Presnjakov exposed the fallacies of the traditional Bogoljubskij legend and asked that the reign be reevaluated in some detail. Only one scholar has responded to the challenge — N. N. Voronin, who has devoted most of his professional life to the evaluation of the art and architecture of Vladimir-Suzdal' and, on several occasions, to the analysis of Andrej's political ideology.[49] I wish to acknowledge my debt to the works of Presnjakov and Voronin and to proceed one step further toward the elimination of a lingering misconception about Russia's past. In the following pages I shall analyze the political and ecclesiastical policies of Prince Andrej and their reflection in the ideological writings associated with his reign.

I have divided the book into two sections. The first part presents an interpretation of Andrej's career. Chapter I focuses on efforts to acquire hegemony over the Russian land (*Russkaja zemlja*) or *Rus'*, as it was often called in Andrej's time.[50] This chapter concerns itself as well with the quest for hegemony in the more limited sphere of the Rostov Land,[51] where Bogoljubskij dwelled and developed his holy city of Vladimir. Politics during this era were inextricably connected with the church; the second chapter presents an interpretation of the Prince's struggle to control the bishopric of Rostov and to check the power of the all-Russian metropolitanate at Kiev.

Part Two explores the ideological tracts composed by Bogoljubskij bookmen. These tracts sacralize the policies and accomplishments of their hero and weave political myths to justify his life, his death, and his historical mission. The tracts constitute the largest extant compendium associated with a single Kievan princely reign; they form a *summa* of the twilight of grand princely ideology.

I begin with what actually happened and conclude with the way the Prince and his entourage perceived it and promoted it at the time.

Part One:
The Man

Introduction: Historiographical Survey

The achievements of Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij have intrigued historians ever since he ruled. Fascination, however, has not always permitted an objective assessment of the reign. Distortion of the Prince's aspirations and achievements has stemmed from the prejudices of his own day, the exaggeration of his power by Muscovite chroniclers, and the uncritical examination of Kievan and Muscovite sources by modern Russian and Soviet historians.

Prince Andrej began the distortion by issuing political tracts in his own behalf. These tracts, to be discussed individually in Part Two of this volume, portray a powerful, superhuman monarch whose conduct was guided exclusively from heaven. Likewise, hostile contemporaries created a distorted impression of the reign. The *Hypatian Chronicle* of the late fifteenth century includes a number of antagonistic comments which reflect the views of Andrej's time. One learns from this account that Andrej "wanted to be autocrat (*samovlastec'*) of all the land of Suzdal'."[1] A stern, overly ambitious ruler, he was the victim of "overweening pride and arrogance"[2] who, on one occasion, "lost his good sense and became filled with intemperate wrath."[3] His immoderate behavior inclined him to threaten his princely brethren and thus to sow discord into the peace-loving land of Kiev. The *Chronicle* records some rather dramatic statements which Andrej allegedly issued to his colleagues. He told one princely rival to get out of Russia: ". . . because you do not behave according to my will, I do not want you in the land of *Rus'*."[4] Andrej's speeches display a power-hungry prince who treated his fellow princes as vassals. The "evidence" of the *Hypatian Chronicle* was soon to substantiate the Muscovite perceptions of Prince Andrej: he was to be transformed from a man who "lost his good sense" into an imperial potentate.

During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Muscovite chroniclers struggled to establish genealogical and ideological continuity with the remote Russian past. They imposed their own political values on the princes of Kiev. To convey the impression of a smooth, uninterrupted line of progress from Kiev, through Vladimir, to Moscow, they emphasized the pivotal

Novgorod. In 1024, when he was Prince of Novgorod, Jaroslav travelled to the town of Suzdal' on the Kamenka River, where he pacified a group of pagan upstarts, dubbed "magicians" (*volxvy*).[11] Jaroslav's voyage could suggest the Novgorodian origin of the earliest conversion efforts in the Rostov-Suzdal' area. Although Jaroslav never returned to Rostov, several towns arose nearby during the second quarter of the eleventh century, presumably at the behest and under the direction of a viceregent (*posadnik*). Jaroslavl', Kosnjatin, Kleščin, and possibly Uglič and Kostroma were developed at this time.[12] By 1050 the Rostov Land boasted three major towns (Rostov, Suzdal', and Beloozero), several smaller settlements, and, in all likelihood, a substantial contingent of Kievan builders, settlers and clergymen.

To his son Vsevolod, Jaroslav willed the Rostov Land and the principality of Perejaslavl' Južnyj. Vsevolod nominally reigned there from his father's death in 1054 until 1076, when he acceded to the throne in Kiev, where he ruled until 1093. Although Vsevolod apparently never went to Rostov, it is clear that he kept his eye on the territory. In the course of his reign an episcopal see was established there.[13] And his eldest son, Vladimir Monomax, travelled to Rostov on the first of many missions which he performed in Vsevolod's behalf.[14] Monomax would return there several times after he inherited his father's patrimony in 1095.[15]

After Vsevolod's death Monomax encountered opposition to the rule of the Rostov Land. The princes of Černigov also wanted to control the area, for it had already become a substantial source of agricultural wealth and provided ready access to Novgorod. Monomax's son Izjaslav quarreled with Oleg Svjatoslavič of Černigov over control of the area. Finally, in 1097, the Peace of Ljubeč awarded Monomax the coveted patrimony; he guaranteed that Rostov would remain in his family.[16]

Monomax ruled Rostov from afar. Two sons, first Mstislav (1095–96) and then Jurij, with the help of the Rostov chiliarch (*tysjacskij*), Georgij Simonovič,[17] assisted Monomax in conducting the first of a series of elaborate princely building projects in the area. He founded the town Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma, added fortifications to Suzdal', and increased the size of Rostov.[18] Several churches were built under his aegis: the *Patericon* of the Kievan Cave Monastery reports that Monomax built a church in Rostov modelled on a church of that Monastery.[19] He also sponsored the construction of a Cathedral Church in Suzdal' together with Metropolitan Efraim.[20] Finally, many private dwellings modelled on Kievan dwellings date from Monomax's reign,[21] suggesting both a strong Kievan cultural influence on the area and the migrations of war-sick, impoverished southerners to the Volga-Oka valley.

With the economic and military support of the Rostov Land, Monomax checked the forces which undermined Kiev's hegemony over *Rus'*: the devastation of Kiev's borders by the Cumans and the internecine squabbles among the descendants of Jaroslav. Monomax's example appealed to his envious successors, but they could not follow it. Jurij succeeded his father as Prince of the Rostov Land in 1125. He spent his youth in Kiev and in Suzdal', where he resided permanently after 1120.[22] From that time until 1147 he continued his father's plans and expanded the boundaries of the territory. He built several new cities: Juriev-Pol'skij, Perejaslavl' Zalesskij, Dmitrov, Zvenigorod, and Moscow.[23] He developed the court and its administration in Suzdal', avoiding his father's Rostov, which had by that time become a center of local opposition to Kievan interests.[24] Finally, he built churches: the Church of the Savior in Suzdal', the Church of Boris and Gleb in Kidekša, the Church of the Transfiguration of Christ in Perejaslavl' Zalesskij, and the Church of St. George in Vladimir.[25] The southern origin of the names of the towns (Perejaslavl', Zvenigorod, Dmitrov) and of the Kidekša Church reveal the continuation of Monomax's cultural policies of the south.[26]

Although he had spent nearly half a century in the Rostov Land, Jurij could not resist the temptation to control Kiev once he had the claim of seniority on his side. He passed the final decade of his life (1147–57) fighting over and ruling the city where his father had reigned. But Jurij's quest for Kiev was nearly hopeless: he was disliked by the Kievans and was constantly threatened by rival princes who coveted the grand princely office.[27] Moreover, possession of the city (1149, 1151, 1155–57) did little to enhance his quest for domination of all the lands of *Rus'*. Eaten away by the neighboring principalities of Galicia, Volhynia, Smolensk and Černigov, the Kiev Land of the mid-twelfth century had been reduced to the city proper and its environs, to Turov, Pinsk, Perejaslavl' and a thin strip of land along the Goryn River.[28] As it was economically impoverished and geographically confined, the grand principality's strength rested on the mystique of tradition. Control of Kiev enhanced the ruler's prestige, but, if anything, it reduced his power because of the inevitable tentativeness of his reign. Jurij gained Kiev at the expense of the loyalty of his own patrimony, where wealthy landowners grew increasingly hostile to his Kievan obsession.

b. Andrej Abandons Kiev

Prince Andrej rose to power in the context of his father's determined but

futile efforts to control Kiev. He watched Jurij struggle to maintain dominion in an unviable setting. Our chronicles testify to the suffering of a loyal, but restless son in search of new ways to maintain the power and the glory of the grand princes of Kiev.

Andrej was Jurij's second son. His older brother, Rostislav, died in 1151.[29] His mother was Jurij's first wife, the daughter of the Cuman Khan Aepa. Jurij had married Aepovna in 1107[30] and Andrej was born probably a few years later, about 1110–1112.[31] Presumably Andrej was raised in the principality of Rostov: by the 1140s he was already a landowner in and about the town of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma.[32] The identity of his wife is unknown.[33] Since his oldest son Izjaslav participated in a military campaign in 1159[34] and since he married off his only daughter (Rostislava) in the same year,[35] he must have been married between 1135 and 1140.[36] He had three additional sons: Mstislav, Gleb and Jurij, the last destined to become the husband of the Queen Tamara of Georgia.[37]

Andrej was called to the south in 1149 to assist Jurij in his struggle with Izjaslav Mstislavič of Volhynia over Kiev. His interest in his father's quest was at best lukewarm. Although he fought a successful battle at Lutsk in 1149, he nevertheless urged his father to cease his assault on the Volhynian frontier.[38] In 1150 he attempted to mediate a truce between Izjaslav and Jurij from the town of Peresopnica, also without success.[39] In the following year he begged Jurij to leave the south for Suzdal'; when he refused, Andrej left without him "after Jurij detained him for a while."[40] He spent the next four years in the northeast when again he was obliged to participate in Jurij's campaigns. He fought with his father in 1155 for the last time.[41] Jurij took Kiev and awarded his eldest son, Andrej, the town of Vyšegorod[42] and the opportunity to succeed him in Kiev upon his death.

Although his brothers Gleb and Boris appear to have been satisfied with their portions of the kingdom — Perejaslavl' and Turov, respectively,[43] — Andrej refused to remain in the south, preferring to return to the principality of Rostov, officially assigned to his younger brother, Vasil'ko. In the year of Jurij's accession to the Kievan throne (1155) Andrej "went from Vyšegorod to Suzdal' without his father's permission."[44] He had abandoned sacred tradition. Never before had the promise of inheritance of the Kievan throne been so unequivocally rejected.

c. The Reign in the Rostov Land

Chronicle accounts of Andrej's reign are sparse and misleading — even the earliest and most reliable accounts, the flattering *Laurentian* and the

ambivalent *Hypatian Chronicle*.[45] Neither speaks much about the internal situation in the leading towns of the principality, nor of Bogoljubskij's policies toward them. The *Laurentian* account, it should be recalled, is heavily biased in Andrej's favor and exaggerates the ease with which he established control over the principality and all the princes of *Rus'*.[46] The *Hypatian* account, although less laudatory, is equally guilty of distortion: it focuses on the difficulties Bogoljubskij had in effecting his policies, and, because of its Kievan bias, oftentimes exaggerates the authoritarian quality of his hostile intentions.

Andrej's official reign in the principality of Rostov-Suzdal' began in 1157. From the time of his arrival there in 1155 until his appointment as prince, the chronicles fall silent. We are not even certain where he dwelled in these intervening years. According to one of the ideological tracts of the reign, the *Tale of the Miracles of the Icon of the Virgin of Vladimir* (*Skazanie o čudesax vladimirskoj ikony božiej materi*), Andrej proceeded directly to Vladimir, avoiding the traditional strongholds of the principality — Rostov and Suzdal'.[47] The evidence of this tract is to be questioned, however, as it was designed to establish the legitimacy of the transfer of the princely seat from Rostov to Vladimir.

Despite Jurij's decision that Andrej's younger brother, Vasil'ko, assume control of the principality,[48] Andrej was appointed in 1157, immediately after Jurij's death:[49]

> The Rostovians and Suzdalians of common accord appointed [Prince] Andrej, the eldest son of Jurij. They sat him in Rostov and Suzdal' since he was loved by all for his manifold beneficence.

The chronicles provide no information on the apparent opposition of Rostov-Suzdal' to Jurij's candidate, Vasil'ko. They do admit, however, that Andrej's election violated an oath previously sworn to Jurij.[50] One might imagine that the party responsible for the election was loath to continue supporting Jurij's efforts to take Kiev at the expense of the well-being of Rostov-Suzdal'. Andrej may have promised, moreover, to extricate his subjects from their historic obligations to Kiev and to protect their more immediate military interests vis-à-vis Novgorod and the Bulgars. In any event, it is clear that from the outset of the reign the Prince enjoyed and depended upon the support of the aristocracy of the traditional centers of the principality.

Andrej's reign can be divided into two parts: the period of internal consolidation and development from 1157 until 1168 and the period of involvement in the internecine quarrels over control of Novgorod and Kiev

from 1168 until his murder in 1175. During the first period Andrej appears to have held the support of the wealthy citizens of the principality, or at least to have established a power base in Vladimir which was sufficient to keep them in check. During the second period, however, he lost such support, probably because of his renewed and constant involvement in military campaigns waged to prevent enemy princes from gaining control over a significant portion of the remainder of *Rus'*.

During the period of consolidation Andrej devoted considerable energies to his famous building projects. Immediately after his election he completed the churches and monasteries which Jurij's death left unfinished.[51] In 1158 he began to develop Vladimir: he enlarged the city and built additional fortifications, including the fortress of the Golden Gates, modelled very much on the Golden Gates of Kiev.[52] He endowed the Church of Vladimir with enormous properties in and around the city.[53] He built the Church of the Virgin in Vladimir, dedicated to the Dormition, between 1158 and 1160.[54] He constructed a chapel in the Golden Gates, completed in 1161.[55] The Church of the Savior in Vladimir and the Church of the Intercession on the Nerl River (Pokrov-na-Nerli), just north of Vladimir, followed soon thereafter.[56] During the early 1160s he built a new town, Bogoljubovo, according to the chronicles "as far from Vladimir as Vyšegorod was from Kiev."[57] Other towns followed: Andrejcevo, Andreevskaja, Glebovo, Boriskova, Mixajlovskoe, Mixajlovka.[58] In Bogoljubovo he constructed a palace where he presumably dwelled during most of his reign, and where he was brutally murdered.[59] The bulk of these building projects were located in and about Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma, the city with which he sought to replace Kiev.

During the early 1160s Andrej rid himself of all princely opposition to his policies. In 1162 he expelled his brother Vasil'ko, Jurij's candidate for the principality of Rostov. He also removed his brother Mstislav, his half-brother and successor Vsevolod (Bol'šoe Gnezdo), his stepmother, the Kiev-appointed Bishop Leon, his nephews, who were the sons of his deceased older brother Rostislav, and the *perednye muži* of his father.[60] He acted thus, the *Hypatian Chronicle* relates, "because he wanted to be autocrat (*samovlastec'*) of all the land of Suzdal'."[61] Andrej's brothers went to Constantinople where they were favorably received: Vasil'ko found himself in possession of several towns along the Danube and Mstislav of the *volost'* 'Otskalan'.[62] Leon returned to Kiev where he was greeted warmly by Rostislav Mstislavič of Smolensk, then Prince of Kiev and the ally of the Byzantine Emperor.[63] The expulsion of Leon, and possibly of the entire

pro-Kievan party, was supported by the Rostovians and Suzdalians, still favorably disposed toward their Prince.[64]

In 1164 Andrej defeated the Volga Bulgars.[65] To believe the chronicles, this was the only battle in which he personally fought throughout his reign. Presumably he had the unqualified support of his bojars, for the Bulgars were the traditional enemy of the principality of Rostov.[66] They represented a constant threat to the security of the principality's participation in the ever active Volga trade into the Caspian Sea.[67] Andrej depended upon the white stone found in Bulgar territory to build his churches and it is conceivable that the Bulgars precipitated Andrej's raid by impeding the regular flow of this commodity to the Rostov Land.

Together with his son Izjaslav, his brother Jaroslav and Prince Jurij of Murom, Andrej conquered several Bulgar towns, including the capital Brjaximov, the Great City. The defeat of the deadliest of Bogoljubskij's enemies enhanced his prestige considerably and a holiday was established in its honor.[68] But if Andrej's popularity in Rostov was enhanced by this victory, the battle probably caused the deaths of two of his strongest allies. Andrej's oldest son Izjaslav and his brother Jaroslav died in 1165 and 1166,[69] respectively, probably due to wounds received from the Bulgars.

During the early part of the reign Prince Andrej held his involvement with the other princes of *Rus'* to a minimum. In 1158 he sent an army of Rostovians, Suzdalians, Vladimirites and Muromites to Smolensk in support of Izjaslav Davydovič of Černigov against the allies of Rostislav of Kiev. The army was commanded by Andrej's son Izjaslav. The arrival in Smolensk of the combined forces under Izjaslav Andreevič and Izjaslav Davydovič intimidated the enemy and Andrej's son was able to return home without doing battle.[70] In 1158 Andrej cemented his alliance with Izjaslav Davydovič by uniting in marriage his only daughter with Izjaslav's nephew, Svjatoslav Vsevolodič of Vščiž.[71] Shortly after the encounter in the principality of Smolensk Izjaslav Davydovič became Prince of Kiev (1158–60).

In 1160 Andrej secured control of Novgorod by appointing, as his father had before him, a close ally to the Novgorodian throne. The *Hypatian Chronicle* claims that Andrej ordered the Novgorodians to accept peacefully and quietly his choice of a prince.[72] The Novgorodians complied and requested Andrej's son. Andrej refused, however, probably because he preferred to occupy his son with military missions. Instead, Andrej sent along his brother Mstislav, probably to get him out of the Rostov Land from which Andrej would formally expel him two years hence. But the

Novgorodians had no interest in Andrej's brother Mstislav, who had already experienced a turn as their prince under Jurij's aegis. Consequently Andrej sent his nephew, another Mstislav, the son of Rostislav of Smolensk.[73] Andrej recalled Mstislav Rostislavič in 1161, having reached a *modus vivendi* with his uncle Rostislav, who had replaced Izjaslav Davydovič as Prince of Kiev in 1160. Rostislav sent his son Svjatoslav to Novgorod, and Andrej received a substantial portion of the Novgorod tribute.[74]

Between 1161 and 1167 Andrej refrained from interference in Novgorodian and Kievan affairs, preferring to leave them to Rostislav. He acted thus in part because of his consolidation and development campaign and in part, probably, because Rostislav was a lesser evil than their shared enemies, the Izjaslaviči of Volhynia, by now the traditional foes of the house of Rostov-Suzdal'.

During the first decade of Andrej's reign many factors combined to ensure relative peace in the Rostov Land and a harmony of interests between the wealthy aristocracy and the Prince. This peace and harmony undoubtedly contributed to the apparent ease with which Andrej erected towns and churches of unprecedented number. The enormity and intensity of his building projects strikes the reader of the early chronicles as well as the present day observer of the reconstructed churches of Bogoljubskij's time. The economic resources for these projects remain something of a mystery. We know that together with the support of the aristocracy Andrej enjoyed the cooperation of stone masons and builders who dwelled in the town of Vladimir[75] and who found readily accessible the white stone used to build the churches. We know, too, that merchants passed through the region,[76] which must have profited from its key position on the Volga-Caspian trade route. Studies of the burial mounds on the geographical extremities of the principality indicate the growth and spread of the population and the agricultural productivity of these rich black soil regions.[77] Finally, the probable cessation of tribute payments to Kiev, combined with the collection of tribute from Novgorod, added substantial riches to the region.

Thus, in a time of relative peace, Bogoljubskij enjoyed many of the ingredients essential to the development of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma and the quest for *samovlastie*. By the middle of the reign he had been strikingly successful in his efforts to create a new political and ecclesiastical center. Vladimir had become a most prominent city, protected by the oldest living son of the late Grand Prince Jurij and by his loyal subjects — the aristocracy of Rostov and Suzdal' and the townspeople of Vladimir.

Yet soon thereafter everything changed. Given the prosperity and contentment of the first half of the reign, it is perplexing indeed to confront the total transformation in policy and mood which characterized the second half. The chronicles cease abruptly to speak of the building of churches and the growth of towns and focus entirely on the internecine quarrels of the successor states of Kievan *Rus'*.

Several factors combined to undermine the tranquil prosperity of Andrej's patrimony. In 1167 Andrej's enemy Mstislav Izjaslavič of Volhynia replaced Rostislav in Kiev. Mstislav's presence there undoubtedly constituted a personal affront to the ambitious Prince as well as a serious threat to his interest in maintaining peaceful control over a large part of the south. Andrej could not readily stand by and watch Mstislav undermine the political power base which his father Jurij had struggled so desperately to acquire. In addition to the new presence in Kiev of a serious rival, by 1167 Andrej had experienced continued frustration in his attempts to seat his own appointee as head of the Church of Rostov, a problem to be discussed at length in the next chapter. The combined hostilities of ecclesiastical and political forces at Kiev must have induced Andrej to embark on a policy of aggressive intervention in the affairs of the south.

Trouble arose first and foremost over Novgorod. The *First Novgorod Chronicle* relates that in 1167 Svjatoslav Rostislavič was obliged to leave Novgorod because the Novgorodians preferred to have a son of Mstislav Izjaslavič as their Prince. Andrej supported Svjatoslav with troops from Rostov, Suzdal', Vladimir, Smolensk and Polotsk under Roman and Mstislav Rostislaviči of Smolensk. They burned several cities on the Novgorod side of the Rostov border. The Novgorodians murdered Svjatoslav's *posadnik* and several other officials and called in Roman Mstislavič who arrived on April 14, 1168.[78]

Andrej depended upon income from Novgorod, which he could obtain only through direct or indirect control of the princely seat. Roman's arrival there forced him into a large-scale war with Izjaslav Mstislavič. For the first time since he left the south in 1155 Andrej became deeply involved in Kievan politics. And just as concern with Kiev destroyed Jurij Dolgorukij, so the quest for the decaying city would undermine Andrej's political well-being. Whereas Jurij went south to take control of Kiev, however, Andrej never left his patrimony, preferring to wage war from a distance, ambivalent about his association with the traditional capital. From Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma he organized an impressive array of troops. Under the leadership of his son Mstislav and the general (*voevoda*) Boris Žiroslavič, troops from Vladimir, Suzdal', and Rostov, combined with the armies of eleven

other princes from the principalities of Smolensk, Černigov, Perejaslavl' Južnyj, Vruči, Dorogobuž and Vyšegorod, sacked Kiev. They expelled Mstislav Izjaslavič and imprisoned his wife and children. They pillaged the city, burned homes and robbed churches, each prince grabbing booty and relics from the defenseless old town. The situation went completely out of control and in 1169 Kiev suffered severe devastation.[79]

With or without Bogoljubskij's approval the great city received a terrible blow. The princes of *Rus'*, heretofore eager to control Kiev, now were content to neutralize it in order that no rival could possibly wish to rule there. It is difficult to say whether or not Andrej ordered the "neutralization." What is clear is that he could not free himself from the lure of the aging *stol'nyj gorod*. Still, he was less attracted to Kiev than was his father. The remnants of the half-destroyed city were his, yet he had no interest in ruling there. He gave Kiev to his brother Gleb, Prince of Perejaslavl' since 1155.[80] Gleb was now Prince of Kiev, but Andrej was senior prince — in Vladimir.

Once Mstislav was exiled to his native Volhynia and Gleb Jur'evič was in Kiev, Andrej set about regaining control of Novgorod. In 1169 a Novgorodian army launched an offensive against Polotsk, Smolensk, and Volok, territories under Andrej's remote control. Andrej retaliated with a force of seven thousand soldiers from Rostov, Suzdal', Vladimir, Smolensk, Rjazan and Murom under the leadership of Mstislav Andreevič and the general Boris Ziroslavič. They burned several villages, collected prisoners and in general wrought havoc in the western section of the Novgorod Land. But the Novgorodians successfully defended their city under Roman Mstislavič (the future Galician Prince) and the viceregent Jakun.[81] The unsuccessful siege, however, did not result in defeat. Andrej forced Novgorod to pay higher prices on Suzdalian grains, and Novgorod requested from Andrej his choice for Prince.[82] He sent Rjurik, the son of the late Svjatoslav Rostislavič, over whose expulsion Andrej had ordered the attack on Kiev.[83] Thus by 1170 Andrej secured the thrones of Novgorod and Kiev for his allies.

Control over Novgorod and Kiev, however, was at best tenuous. Rjurik Svjatoslavič lost interest in Novgorod and voluntarily left his not very disappointed subjects in 1171.[84] He was succeeded in the following year by Andrej's son Jurij. Within two years, Jurij was expelled from Novgorod and replaced by Svjatoslav, the son of Mstislav Izjaslavič of Kiev.[85] After an unsuccessful campaing against the Bulgars in 1172[86] and the consequent death of his son Mstislav,[87] Andrej found himself involved once again in a struggle over the throne of Kiev. His brother Gleb died suddenly in 1173

and Andrej suspected the Rostislaviči of murder. Guilty or not, the Rostislaviči — Roman, David and Mstislav of Smolensk — combined forces with Izjaslav Mstislavič of Volhynia against Andrej and his candidate for Kiev, Mixalko Jur'evič. The Ol'goviči of Černigov temporarily joined Andrej's side. Futile negotiations preceded the battle: Andrej ordered Mstislav to leave Kiev and the Rostislaviči to retire to Smolensk. After his face and scalp were shaven, the messenger bearing the ill-fated tidings was returned home with Mstislav's refusal to recognize Andrej's authority. War ensued with the marching southward of the combined forces of Rostov-Suzdal' — Vladimir, Smolensk (the faction opposed to the Rostislaviči in Kiev), Polotsk, Pinsk, Turov, Gorodec, Novgorod, with Andrej's brothers Mixalko and Vsevolod, Andrej's nephews Jaropolk and Mstislav Rostislavič and Vladimir Glebovič, and above all with Prince Svjatoslav Vsevolodič of Černigov. The great force failed, due in no small measure to the defection of its commanding prince, Svjatoslav of Černigov, who was more out for himself than for Andrej. The enemy held out in Kiev and Mstislav's brother became Prince.[88] Andrej had lost control of Kiev to the son of his father's arch-rival Izjaslav. The princes of Volhynia and Smolensk overwhelmed the shaky forces ordered south in 1173 by Andrej. He refused to go south and in his absence his troops were defeated.

The unsuccessful attack on Kiev was the final campaign of the reign. Two years later Prince Andrej met with his death. The specific causes of the infamous murder were never enumerated in the chronicles, but its occurrence directly after a five year period of exhausting campaigns suggests the disillusionment of his backers. The unsuccessful raid on the Bulgars must have been especially damaging to the Prince's status in view of the economic importance of the resources of that region for his patrimony. Moreover, nearly every year for six years the militias of Rostov, Suzdal' and Vladimir were at war; they marched over eight thousand kilometers to meet with critically humiliating defeat. One can well imagine what the morale of Andrej's armies must have been by 1173, not to mention the disposition of the bojars of Rostov and Suzdal' who sustained these crucial military and economic losses.

The *Laurentian Chronicle* alludes to domestic difficulties in 1169, when Andrej's principal liaison with the Church of Vladimir, Fedor, was evicted from the principality and brutally murdered in Kiev.[89] Although Andrej allegedly sided with the injured parties by sending Fedor off to receive his punishment, given Fedor's "crime" it is far more likely that Andrej abandoned the criminal churchman when the latter's position became untenable. Fedor exercised little restraint in confiscating property and arms for

the sake of the Church and in brutally punishing all those who opposed his activities. It would appear that already by 1169 Andrej and his chief ecclesiastical administrator were obliged to terrorize their subjects into obedience and that opposition to his economic and military needs found expression in hostility toward Fedor. In 1172 the armies themselves began to complain. Some of the soldiers involved in the Bulgar campaign refused to show up for the battle, claiming a disinclination to march in the winter.[90]

But these expressions of hostility were minor compared to the dramatic conclusion of the reign. On the evening of June 29, 1175 a group of twenty conspirators, including the wealthiest bojars of the principality and members of Andrej's administration, resolved to murder their Prince. The leader of the group was Peter Kučkov, of the family associated with the founding of Moscow. The conspirators gathered at Peter's house in Bogoljubovo. Peter's nephew Jakim had heard a rumor that Andrej was planning to have his brother murdered. The conspirators were frightened that one of them would be the next to go. Andrej's relations with his wealthy nobles and administrators had become so strained that murder was the only recourse. The conspirators stole into Andrej's palace, broke down his bedroom door, and hacked him to death.[91]

News of the murder spread quickly. The conspirators themselves ransacked Andrej's palace and riots broke out in Vladimir and the surrounding villages. Rostovians and Suzdalians confiscated from the church of Vladimir the properties which Bogoljubskij had donated early in the reign. The homes of loyal administrators — *posadniki, tiuny, detskie* and *mečniki* — were plundered and their masters murdered. The Rostovians and Suzdalians chose as their princes the two sons of Rostislav — Mstislav and Jaropolk, whom Andrej had expelled in 1162. The docile new princes permitted and encouraged the wealthy bojars of the towns of Rostov and Suzdal' to crush the inhabitants of Vladimir, the townspeople of Andrej's new principal city. Civil war ensued and lasted three years. Finally in 1177 Vsevolod Jur'evič became prince and the Vladimirites overcame the bojar threat.[92] The new Prince, responsible more than any other ruler for fulfilling Andrej's quest for the hegemony of Vladimir within the principality of Rostov, avoided the errors of his half-brother and father. He wooed the bojars and stayed reasonably clear of Kiev and the interprincely squabbles of the south. Vsevolod's half-century reign (1177–1212) completed the evolution of the Rostov Land from a remote principality near the Volga to one of the strongest successor states of Kievan *Rus'*.

d. The Significance of the Reign

Andrej Bogoljubskij was a transitional figure in the history of Kievan *Rus'* and the emergence of the successor states of the so-called appanage period. He participated in the evolution of the principality of Rostov from a minor province at the northeastern border to one of the strongest principalities of *Rus'*. The Rostov Land survived the incessant civil wars, the economic dislocation, and the constant hostilities of pagan neighbors which threatened to undermine all of post-Kievan *Rus'*. Andrej must have experienced acute disillusion in the latter part of the reign, for he was neither master of his own house nor the legislator of all-Russian politics. Yet his remarkable energies, combined with what must have been enormous administrative talent, contributed to making Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma one of the most powerful cities of his day and one of the successor cities to Kiev, upon whose model the newer city was developed.

Andrej conducted himself according to the patterns established by Kievan princes. He sought to manage the princely seats of the crucial strongholds of *Rus'* by placing younger brothers, nephews and close allies on their thrones — very much in the style of Jaroslav the Wise, Vladimir Monomax, Jurij Dolgorukij, and his more powerful contemporaries. He aspired to be an autocrat in his own patrimony just as his kinsmen, the Rostislaviči of Smolensk, the Ol'goviči of Černigov, the Mstislaviči of Volhynia, then Galicia, sought political unity in their respective patrimonies. No more than his contemporaries could Prince Andrej manage the dual policy of developing his patrimony and attempting to hold control of Kiev.

Yet he tried, harder than most, to fulfill the quest for *samovlastie*. His stubborn, willful staying power, despite overwhelming obstacles, forced the issue: the only way to check his determination was to kill him.

It seems tragic that Prince Andrej acquired the coveted grand princely title only after his death. To be sure, the meaning of the title *velikij knjaz'* had been weakened by a century of internecine struggle. The grand prince of the mid-twelfth century was fortunate if he controlled his own patrimony and at the same time ruled tentatively in Kiev either personally or through a dependent prince or *područnik*. Yet Prince Andrej sought to give the title renewed meaning.[93]

It was the fascination with Kiev more than any other factor which impeded Andrej's quest for *samovlastie*. Chosen Prince of his native principality, Andrej stubbornly persisted in his efforts to hold on to the south, a

policy which strained the pockets of the bojars of Rostov and Suzdal' who appointed him. He lost his most crucial supporters and paid with his life for eroding their fortunes in the pursuit of the traditions of Monomax and Dolgorukij. Ironically, Andrej's decision to remain in Vladimir after his allies took Kiev in 1168 may have been a blunder. Had he abandoned his patrimony and ruled in Kiev he might not have been murdered. But he had learned a valuable lesson from Jurij's failure: Kiev was a fading town. He sought to neutralize the old *stol'nyj gorod* — rather than to rule it — and to replace it with Vladimir. He exhausted and antagonized his allies within the principality of Suzdal' by constantly reaching beyond its borders. The mystique of Kiev, the conquering city of his heroic predecessors whom he emulated in all the expressions of his political ideology which have survived, undid him. The final dream of his life was to build a church there "as a memory to all my patrimony,"[95] a wish to retain in the consciousness of posterity his claim to Kiev and to the power it once exerted.

It is one of the great ironies of Russian history that the tragic consequences of Andrej's policies transformed him into a martyr. His good reputation was restored with the reestablishment of Vladimirite power. Prince Vsevolod ordered the completion of the chronicling of Andrej's reign in 1177;[96] this chronicle redaction regarded Vsevolod's predecessor as the founder of the new, Virgin-protected political center of Vladimir. His life had been taken that the new city could thrive. Vsevolod drew on Andrej's accomplishments to revive the war-torn city and to build up a principality sufficiently strong to survive the rule of the Golden Horde. Vsevolod learned well, however, the lesson of the reign of his murdered half-brother: Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma and the Rostov Land could not survive if too closely tied to Kiev.

II

The Prince and the Church

Prince Andrej was determined to control the affairs of the church. He knew well that political domination of the Rostov Land depended upon subordinating to his authority the bishopric of Rostov, which had become one of the principality's most powerful institutions. His effort, to which he devoted enormous energy, failed; but it illustrates his persistent thirst for power and hegemony over his princely domain.

To rule the church the Prince undertook a threefold mission: to control the see of Rostov, to remove it from the jurisdiction of the metropolitanate of Kiev, and to establish a new metropolitan see at Vladimir — a see not subordinate to Kiev, but directly responsible to the patriarchate of Constantinople. All three missions were intertwined and centered around the creation of a new cathedral city free from the constraints of tradition. Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma became the focal point in the Prince's relations with the church: it was to be the city of the new power, the city to supersede not only Rostov and Suzdal', but Kiev as well.

In studying the Prince's relations with the church between 1155 and 1175, we have a limited number of reliable sources to work with. No single source provides an uninterrupted chronicling of Andrej's encounters with the bishopric of Rostov; nevertheless, a careful collation of the available data suggests an episodic yet regular development roughly parallel to the political situation traced in the previous chapter.

Our oldest and most reliable chronicles are, as before, the *Laurentian*[1] and the *Hypatian*,[2] useful both for their corroborative and their conflicting evidence. The *Patericon of the Kievan Cave Monastery*, another chronicle whose evidence on the twelfth century can be trusted, supplies helpful background on certain prominent monastic and secular clergy. The sixteenth-century *Nikon Chronicle*[4] supplements earlier data but must be used with caution because of its late date and Muscovite bias. Two twelfth-century Byzantine chronicles — the histories of Cinnamus[5] and Nicetas Choniates[6] — provide a background of Byzantine attitudes toward the various principalities of twelfth-century *Rus'*.

Apart from the chronicles, shorter works crucial to an understanding of Andrej's ecclesiastical policy include letters from the Byzantine Patriarchate[7] and a sermon on Andrej's ecclesiastical activities delivered by Cyril of Turov.[8] Several seals have been preserved which tend to support the data of the more literary evidence.[9] Finally, the churches and other ecclesiastical remains of Andrej's reign testify to the enormous and impressive development of Vladimir.

Scholarly works on the subject are rather sparse. Aside from the general ecclesiastical histories of Makarij, Golubinskij and Kartašev,[10] Priselkov's *Očerki po cerkovno-političeskoj istorii Kievskoj Rusi X–XII vv.*,[11] Sokolov's *Russkij arxierej iz Vizantii*,[12] and the collective writings of Voronin[13] are the only works which analyze in any detail Bogoljubskij's position *vis-à-vis* the church. And these works devote much less attention to Andrej's ecclesiastical encounters than to the phenomenon of church-building during Andrej's reign. A recent article by W. Vodoff, however, concentrates on the affairs of the Church and has been of enormous help in the narrative to follow.[14]

From our various sources we can reconstruct a number of dramatic struggles between the Prince and the various forces he tried to subject to his authority. When he assumed control of the Rostov Land, Andrej confronted two ecclesiastical rivals at times allied with one another. His first rival was the metropolitanate of Kiev, which, despite the political decline of that city, retained hegemony over the bishoprics of twelfth-century *Rus'*. The second rival was the powerful see of Andrej's principality, which had risen since its origin in the 1070s[15] to one of the prominent bishoprics of its day. Its official name was the bishopric of Rostov, although by Andrej's reign it had come to be known also as the bishopric of Suzdal', there being cathedral churches in both cities.

Most of Andrej's ecclesiastical activities occurred between 1155, when he settled permanently in Vladimir, and 1169, after which his power began to diminish. The chronicles testify to his determination to enhance the importance of Vladimir with churches of magnificence commensurate with his goals of internal consolidation and all-Russian prominence. They testify as well to the difficulties he encountered in trying to achieve these ends. Against a backdrop of an intensive campaign to enlarge the ecclesiastical riches of Vladimir, one finds now a hint of opposition and now explicit resistance to his policies from the metropolitan of Kiev, from the patriarch of Constantinople, and from ecclesiastical and secular milieus in the Rostov Land.

Andrej began the ecclesiastical expansion of Vladimir soon after he

established permanent residence there. According to the *Laurentian Chronicle*[16]

> Prince Andrej laid the foundation in Vladimir of the stone Church of the Holy Virgin on Tuesday, April 10 [1158]... He endowed the Church with many private landholdings, with lands which he purchased outside the town, with revenues, with other fine villages, with a tithe of his herds and with a tithe of his market revenues. And he laid the foundation of a larger city there.

This passage further reports that Andrej founded new monastic centers and completed the church projects which his father, Jurij, had begun before he died in 1157. The *Hypatian Chronicle* more or less parallels the *Laurentian*, but suggests as well the motivation for the generous endowments in behalf of the Church of the Virgin of Vladimir: "He decorated all the domes with gold and made an episcopate within it."[17] Despite this chronicler's assertion, no new bishopric was established at this time. Yet his implication was accurate enough: Andrej wished to establish an episcopal center to coincide with his political base of power in Vladimir.

A hint of opposition from Kiev is registered already in 1156, with the first in a series of conflicts over the bishop of Rostov. The Metropolitanate consistently opposed the Prince's choice, and vice versa. In 1156, we learn from the *Laurentian Chronicle*, a certain Nestor, Bishop of Rostov, "went to *Rus'* [i.e. to Kiev] and was deprived of his bishopric."[18]

We may surmise that Nestor was on Andrej's side. That Nestor's deposition immediately followed Andrej's permanent settlement in Vladimir — a settlement which went contrary to the wishes of his father, Jurij — certainly suggests that the bishop supported Andrej's ecclesiastical activities. Moreover, the chronicler's allusion to Nestor's ill fate follows directly upon the information that "Metropolitan Constantine arrived from Tsargrad, and the Prince [Jurij] and the people treated him with honor."[19] Voronin suggests quite plausibly that the newly arrived Metropolitan (Constantine I) may have been distressed by Nestor's reluctance to come and greet him,[20] in which case it would be all the more probable that Nestor was loyal to Andrej. Further evidence points to the Bishop's allegiance to Andrej. In a reference to Nestor's would-be successor the *Laurentian Chronicle* relates that "Bishop Leon was unjustly appointed in Suzdal', since Nestor, Bishop of Suzdal', was still alive."[21] Thus spoke Prince Andrej's chronicler, professing the legitimacy of Nestor despite the appearance, with Kiev's backing, of another contender for the office.

In its discussion of Nestor's plight the *Nikón Chronicle* adds that

"Nestor was denounced by his own entourage (*svoi domašnye*) and placed under an interdict."[22] Already by 1156, assuming the accuracy of this later source, the see of Rostov was divided on the question of loyalty to the metropolitanate. Nestor's betrayal by his own clergy was probably a reaction to the bishop's cooperation with the new prince.

Between 1158 and 1165 five new churches appeared in and about Vladimir. The development of the city and the emergence of new churches in Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma exacerbated the resentment of the Rostov clergy toward Andrej's handling of ecclesiastical affairs. A fire which totally devastated the episcopal church of Rostov in 1160 provided the occasion for the Prince's attempt to check Rostov's ecclesiastical strength.[23] The *Life of Leontius of Rostov,* a hagiographical work written during his reign, speaks of Andrej's opposition to rebuilding a large church in that city and of his preference for a significantly smaller edifice. But the same source reports that the Prince reluctantly yielded to the Rostovians and ordered the erection of an appropriately magnificent structure.[24] Archaeological evidence reveals that this church was in fact even larger than the Church of the Virgin in Vladimir, Andrej's proposed cathedral church.[25] Clearly, Rostovian as well as Kievan resistance to the growth of Vladimir could not be easily quelled.

At the peak of the church building in Vladimir Andrej became involved in a struggle with Kiev and with Rostov over the candidacy of Bishop Leon. To understand the chronicle accounts of this struggle one must know about a contemporary dispute both among Russian ecclesiastics and between the Russian and Byzantine clergy. Relations between the Russian monastic clergy, especially the monks of the Kiev Cave Monastery, and the Greek clergy in *Rus'* were considerably strained. Polikarp, *Igumen* of this Monastery, led the Russian monastic opposition, supported by a substantial contingent of Russian (i.e. non-Greek) priests, to the practice of maintaining normal abstinence from meat consumption on Wednesdays and Fridays when these days coincided with major holidays such as Christmas, Easter, and Theophany. Whereas most of the Russian clergy supported breaking the fast on these occasions, Greek clerics in Russia demanded abstinence. Byzantium, too, was divided on this issue. Her monastic centers favored the lenient view and found among their supporters the Emperor Manuel Comnenus. The patriarchate, on the other hand, and hence most of the prelates whom it directed to *Rus'*, insisted on strict observance of the fast. This dietary dispute became the subject of serious, inflammatory debate during this period, and the struggle over Leon's candidacy involved a quarrel over this issue.[26]

Bishop Leon, Nestor's replacement, arrived from Kiev in 1158[27] and in the following year was expelled by the Rostovians and Suzdalians for having imposed heavy financial burdens on the priesthood.[28] Loath to forfeit funds to Kiev, Andrej supported the expulsion. Metropolitan Constantine was ill-disposed toward Andrej's expulsion of Leon and ordered the Bishop to return to his see to continue his duties. But Prince and Bishop could not live peacefully in the same principality. According to the *Laurentian Chronicle* they quarreled primarily over the issue of the holiday fast:[29]

> In that year (1164) the heresy of Leon began . . . Leon was appointed unjustly in Suzdal' because Nestor, Bishop of Suzdal', was still alive; yet Leon usurped the seat of Nestor. He began to teach in Suzdal' the abstention from meat on divine holidays, on Wednesdays and Fridays, on the day of the Birth of the Lord and on the Day of his Baptism. A great quarrel over this took place before the pious Prince Andrej and before all the people; even the lord (*vladyka*) Fedor challenged him. He (Leon) went to Tsargrad for vindication. An'drian, a Bulgarian bishop, detained him before Tsar Manuel while the Tsar was camped above the river (Danube). When Leon spoke to the Tsar, the imperial servants struck Leon on the neck and wanted to drown him in the river. At that time there were also present embassies from Kiev, Suzdal' and Černigov . . . .

The *Hypatian Chronicle* relates a somewhat different account of the struggle entered two years earlier, *sub anno* 1162:[30]

> In that year Andrej expelled Bishop Leon from Suzdal'. He also expelled his brothers, Mstislav and Vasil'ko and his nephews, the two sons of Rostislav . . . He brought Leon back to Rostov, however, after Leon repented his sin. But he was not allowed to sit in Suzdal'. Leon stayed in the episcopate four months. Andrej began to ask him about eating meat on Wednesdays and Fridays from the Day of Christ's Resurrection to Pentecost. The Bishop ordered him not to eat meat on Wednesdays and Fridays of Holy Week. Because of his guilt, he (Leon) ran from his land. He came to Černigov to Svjatoslav Ol'govič. Svjatoslav, having placated him successfully, sent him on to Rostislav in Kiev . . . And in that year the sons of Jurij, Mstislav and Vasil'ko, together with their mother and a third brother, the young Vsevolod, came to Tsargrad.

Although divergent, the two accounts can be seen to supplement one another.[31] The *Hypatian* account probably describes events which preceded most of the events described in the *Laurentian* account. Although the *Laurentian Chronicle* dates the events to 1164, the account is summary (*skažem vmale*) and therefore the dating should not be taken too literally. It has no entries whatsoever under 1162 and 1163, the years when most of the struggle probably occurred. Between the expulsions of 1159 and 1163

Leon may have returned to Rostov without Andrej's permission, relying heavily on the support of the Prince's Rostov opponents. In 1163 a public hearing, which may have been a council, was called to air the "heresy" of Leon. And as a result of his heretical views — the insistence of maintaining the fast on holidays — he was expelled once again. If Leon's first expulsion was based on usurpation of office, the second was due, at least ostensibly, to theological error.

From Rostov Leon went first to Svjatoslav of Černigov, Andrej's adversary, who advised him to seek the support of Prince Rostislav of Kiev. Conceivably, Leon's interview with Rostislav occurred between the death of Metropolitan Fedor in 1163 and the arrival of his successor, Ioann, in 1164. This may explain Leon's decision to proceed to Constantinople for vindication, although it is equally possible that he felt the need for Byzantine backing over and above the support of one of the metropolitans. Possibly, too, Rostislav refused to help him, since he was friendly with Andrej at this time.[32]

En route to Byzantium Leon allegedly participated in another dispute over dietary laws. The *Laurentian* account states that Emperor Manuel opposed Leon, and suggests the Tsar's support of Prince Andrej. The historicity of this Bulgarian encounter on the Danube is very dubious. Although Manuel opposed the strict fasting espoused by the patriarchate, even assuming he was in Bulgaria at the time, it is unlikely that he would have permitted the brutal treatment of the candidate of the Metropolitan of Kiev. The Emperor would have been averse, moreover, to dishonoring the protégé of Princes Rostislav of Kiev and Svjatoslav of Černigov, whose embassies were at the imperial camp and whose support in imperial Hungarian campaigns he was so anxious to obtain. It is clear from Cinnamus' account of Manuel's relations with Russia that the Emperor looked favorably upon an alliance with Rostislav.[33] The entire Bulgarian incident was probably the fabrication of the 1177 chronicle compiler, loyal to the policies of Prince Andrej. The authors of the ideological treatises, to be discussed in the ensuing chapters, were fond of placing Andrej in close association with Manuel Comnenus[34] and saw fit to suggest that Prince and Emperor shared an adversary within the Russian church, even though in fact Leon was the Metropolitan's candidate. Moreover, the interview between Manuel and Leon is followed immediately by an account of the intervention of the icon of the Virgin of Vladimir in behalf of Andrej during his battle against the Bulgars on the Volga,[35] an incident directly connected to Andrej's posture as friend and peer of Emperor Manuel.[36] After the Bul-

garian debate, in any event, Leon proceeded to Constantinople to discuss the matter at the patriarchate.

The affair of Leon reveals substantial resistance to Andrej's ecclesiastical policies. The *Laurentian Chronicle*, which mentions the jurisdictional dispute, is respectful of Andrej's piety and Vladimir's right to reject the will of Kiev. According to this account, despite the Metropolitan's wishes, Leon aspired to the bishopric of Suzdal' "*ne po pravde.*" He was accused of "heresy," a term of considerable opprobrium at this time, and his orthodoxy was called into question precisely because he spoke the will of the Metropolitan of Kiev in regard to the legitimacy of his candidacy and the fast controversy. The "orthodox" spokesman at the debate was the "*vladyka*" Fedor, soon to be the Prince's candidate for the desired metropolitanate of Vladimir.

Whereas the *Laurentian Chronicle* stresses Andrej's ecclesiastical autonomy, the less complimentary *Hypatian Chronicle* suggests the real political implications of the affair of Leon. Leon's expulsion is said to coincide with the expulsion of Andrej's brothers, nephews and Greek stepmother.[37] It is no mere coincidence that Leon left Suzdal' in the company of Andrej's principal political adversaries. He had resided for four months in the rival town of Rostov, and Andrej expelled this collection of competitors "because he wanted to be autocrat (*samovlastec'*) of all the land of Suzdal'." Leon, together with Andrej's brothers and nephews, opposed the Prince's autonomy, the first within the church and the others in the political sphere. All were treated well in Constantinople. Of Leon's fate there we shall speak below. The princes were endowed with generous properties.[38]

Sometime after Leon's second expulsion from the bishopric in April of 1164, Andrej asked the Patriarch to denounce Leon and to replace him with a more loyal candidate — not as Bishop of Rostov, but as Metropolitan of Vladimir. He made this request, we surmise, not to create a new ecclesiastical province, but to extricate his own ecclesiastical province from Kievan jurisdiction. To fill this new office Andrej chose Fedor, probably the nephew of one of the Prince's wealthiest bojars, Peter Borislavič, and a former monk at the Kiev Cave Monastery. Fedor, we learned earlier from the *Laurentian* account, supported Andrej against Leon in the debate over holiday fasting.[39]

Andrej's letter of request to Patriarch Luke Chrysoberges is no longer extant, but, as we shall presently see, the Patriarch's return letter informs us of its content. In about 1168 Chrysoberges answered the Prince. Most of Luke's letter is preserved in a sixteenth-century Russian translation[40] and

the remainder is summarized in the *Nikon Chronicle*.[41] The letter begins with disarming flattery:[42]

> O God-loved spiritual son, most royal Prince of Rostov and Suzdal': The letter of Your Highness to Our Humility was brought by your embassy and read at a council. The letter has informed us that through your own concern piety is abounding, for in many places you have raised houses of prayer to God. We praise you for your fine concern . . . We have learned of this not only from Your Highness' letter, but also from your own Bishop who has attested to Your Highness' many pious deeds in the presence of Our Humility, before the Divine Council, and before our holy and powerful Emperor.

Andrej's support of his church was all well and good, Luke acknowledged, but it could not justify the establishment of a new metropolitanate:[43]

> Your letter informs us that since its inception the city of Vladimir has grown great with many inhabitants and that in it you have raised many churches. You do not want Vladimir to be under the jurisdiction of the Bishopric of Rostov and Suzdal', but rather you wish to found a metropolitanate and to have us consecrate as metropolitan Fedor, who is now in your quarters. To be sure, in behalf of your city you have built many churches in the name of God; and for this you will receive compensation many times. But to remove such a city from the jurisdiction of the Bishopric of Rostov and Suzdal' and for him to be metropolitan — this is impossible.

To support his refusal Luke relied upon tradition within Andrej's bishopric:[44]

> Be it known to Your Highness: as we hear, this city is neither of a separate country or province, and you are not the first to embrace it as if it was only recently attached to your principality. It is of the same land and province in which your ancestors dwelled. Although, to be sure, you rule it now, a single bishop has been there for a long time, a single bishop in all this land.

Next the Patriarch discussed the canonicity of establishing a new metropolitan see.[45]

> We consecrate from time to time a holy metropolitan of all Russia, who is consecrated by us in our holy and great church and we send him thither. But we cannot do what you bid, for clearly this is tantamount to a breach of the divine and sacred rules. For the rules of the Holy Apostles and Divine Fathers commanded that the rights of each metropolitanate and bishopric be preserved without breach. And no one can violate these

canons, be they of the Fathers or of the Apostles if he does not want to be estranged from God.

Patriarch Luke based his canonical answer on the law of indivisibility of a bishopric or a metropolitanate, probably as expressed in the Twelfth Canon of the Council of Chalcedon.[46] He threatened Andrej once again with excommunication should he fail to accede to his wishes. Prince Andrej was undoubtedly aware of the unusual nature of his request. Yet precedents rarely stood in his way. Perhaps he was testing the limits of the Patriarch's support of Kiev. And perhaps, too, he expected to be granted the far less radical request of shifting the cathedral city of his bishopric to Vladimir. Luke was indeed prepared to make this concession, should Vladimir remain loyal to the church of Kiev:[47]

> But if Your Highness wishes to live in the city which you built and if a bishop comes to desire to stay there with you, well, then, let the God-loving bishop be with you; in this there is no harm for him, because this city is [already] under his jurisdiction.

Concerning Leon's theological views, Patriarch Luke deferred to the Metropolitan of Kiev:[48]

> We have . . . read the letters which you sent accusing your God-loving Bishop. But since we have been informed in a letter from the blessed Metropolitan and the bishops, and from the embassy of our sovereign and holy Emperor, and from many others that the accusations against your Bishop were discussed many times in your own land at a council as well as before the Grand Prince of all Russia, . . . we do not see fit to judge him in any way since he was already put on the rack there; for the holy canons do not instruct us to do this, but rather that each bishop be judged by his own council.

By yielding to the prerogatives of the ecclesiastical and political heads of *Rus'* and to the support which they received from Emperor Manuel, Patriarch Luke indirectly challenged the religious and secular prerogatives to which Prince Andrej aspired. He calls the Metropolitan "of all *Rus'*" "blessed," the Emperor "sovereign and holy," and the Prince of Kiev the "Grand Prince of all *Rus'*," including, by implication at least, the *Rus'* of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma. Chrysoberges set all of the powers, both secular and ecclesiastical, bolstered in turn by the holy canons, against Andrej's desire to replace Leon.

Although reluctant to usurp the prerogatives of a local council, Luke was not averse to commenting on Andrej's hostility toward Leon:[49]

> This Bishop has been sent to Your Highness, as if from the Lord himself, by Our Humility and by the divine and holy great Council . . . Lock up in your heart every grudge which you bear against the God-loving Bishop and accept him with joy and meekness and love as one who is worthy of the Grace of God . . . Allow him to build his church which the grace of the Holy Spirit has given to him. For this one is pleasing to God and to man.

It was not Bishop Leon's orthodoxy that was in question, but Andrej's. The Patriarch threatened grave consequences should the Prince refuse to accept Leon:[50]

> And again, if, God forbid, you should not believe in his vindication by the Holy Metropolitan of all *Rus'* . . . and if you start to torture him with threats and punishments and if you once again banish him who is holy and given to you by God's gift . . . be it known to you, pious son, even if you fill the entire world with churches and you build up cities beyond reckoning, by driving out your Bishop, who is the head of the church and the people, they will not be churches, but stables. . . .

Andrej's reaction to Luke's letter is absent from our sources. Probably Leon returned to the see of Rostov. Probably, too, he chose to reside in the city of Rostov since the Patriarch had given him the option to dwell in the town of his choice. Undoubtedly, Prince Andrej would not have countenanced the sharing of his beloved city with the protégé of the metropolitan of Kiev and the Rostovians. It is possible, too, that, at first, despite patriarchal disapproval, Andrej held out in favor of Fedor as head of his church. Yet not much later, as will be discussed below, Andrej submitted to the Constantinopolitan decree.

Ironically, Andrej's request for the establishment of a second metropolitan see in *Rus'* led to the strengthening rather than the weakening of Kievan ecclesiastical hegemony in *Rus'*. The title "Metropolitan of all *Rus'*" used in Luke's letter is inscribed on metropolitan seals for the first time during this period and probably testifies to further Byzantine bolstering of the Kievan church.[51]

The *Nikon Chronicle*'s version of Luke's letter to Andrej includes a rather critical evaluation of the character and morals of the Prince's candidate.[52] This portion of the letter, however, may have been an invention of the chronicler, for its content more or less coincides with the assessments of Fedor by previous chroniclers. We are told that "in sooth he was completely deprived of his senses and lost his mind."[53] We are told, too, that Fedor could no more abstain from sexual intercourse than he could from holiday feasting.[54]

Chronicle accounts of Andrej's subsequent relations with Fedor suggest his resignation to the Patriarch's opinion. In 1169 Fedor was brutally put to death by the decree of Metropolitan Constantine II without a sign of disapproval from Andrej. Fedor's denunciation by his own church as well as by the Metropolitan of Kiev dramatically concluded the Prince's struggle for control of the Church. The *Laurentian Chronicle* (s.a. 1169) and the *Hypatian Chronicle* (s.a. 1172) attribute the break in large part to the cleric's reluctance to seek the "blessing" of the Metropolitan of Kiev:[55]

> In that year the Lord and Holy Mother of God performed a new miracle in the city of Vladimir: . . . (they) drove the evil and pernicious and arrogant deceiver, the *vladyka* Fedor out of the golden-domed Church of the Holy Mother of God of Vladimir and out of all the Rostov Land. For he would not seek the blessing [of the Metropolitan of Kiev]; rather, he avoided it. This impure man did not wish to obey the Christ-loving Prince Andrej, who wished that he would go to the Metropolitan of Kiev to be appointed.

It is very questionable that the break between Prince and cleric resulted from such a disagreement. The above passage provides no indication of the nature of the appointment for which Fedor refused to seek the Metropolitan's blessing. It is certainly possible to conjecture that Andrej wished Fedor to become Bishop or Metropolitan of Vladimir and thereby to sever ties with the official bishopric of Rostov.[56] Had this been the case, however, it would not be very surprising if Fedor would have refused to seek the Metropolitan's blessing; he would have anticipated anything but a kind word from the Metropolitan. What is surprising and somewhat suspect is the suggestion that Andrej encouraged Fedor to go, especially after Patriarch Luke's insistence that Leon remain Bishop. Andrej sent Fedor, we are told, "with good wishes and good thoughts."[57] Something seems awry here. Fedor was Andrej's most ardent ally and one wonders whether the Prince would have sent such a valuable and loyal person to seek the blessing of his foe. It is far more likely that the situation in the bishopric of Rostov grew so out of hand that the Prince was forced against his will to desert his protégé. The chronicles probably create a fairly convincing camouflage over what must have been an opportunistic political decision. One should add, to compound the problem, that the history of the metropolitanate at Kiev from 1169 until 1182 remains obscure.

Further study of the *Laurentian* and *Hypatian* accounts suggests a thorough white-wash of Prince Andrej. To believe these accounts, the Prince's candidate completely lost control of his senses:[58]

> Not only did he [Fedor] not wish to be appointed by the Metropolitan, but also he closed all the churches in Vladimir, and took their keys. There were neither bells nor songs in the entire city, even in the cathedral church. But inside this church was the miracle-working Mother of God and all the other saints. To Her come all Christians, running from fear and seeking Her consolation, intercession and protection . . . Fedor closed up this church and so incurred the wrath of God and the Holy Virgin that on that very day he was exiled . . . For many suffered under this man's rule. He confiscated villages, arms, and horses. Others he sent into slavery, imprisoned and robbed — not only the laity but [members] of the clergy as well, monks, priests, and *igumens*. And this merciless tormentor shaved the heads and beards of some, and gouged out the eyes of others and performed unspeakable tortures.

Fedor's confiscation of property and brutal treatment of clergy and laity alike grew intolerable. His exile, no doubt encouraged by forces loyal to Kiev, probably resulted from the excessive demands on the riches of the principality. We are told explicitly that Fedor had done evil to the good people of the Rostov Land.[59] The reference to Rostov might even suggest the coalition of the old guard against Fedor and his innovative techniques in behalf of Vladimir. It is difficult to avoid suspecting Andrej of complicity with Fedor until the very moment of his exile. Despite the chronicler's suggestion that Andrej willingly acceded to the wishes of his subjects, Fedor had probably been the executor of his Prince's demands. And quite conceivably the wealthy citizens of the principality were responsible for his exile as they were, ultimately, for Andrej's death.

Metropolitan Constantine's treatment of Fedor (1169) was unusually severe:[60]

> Metropolitan Constantine ordered his tongue cut out for his evil deeds and his heresy. And he ordered his right hand to be removed and his eyes to be gouged out because he had cursed the Holy Virgin . . . And as a result of his evil deeds the demonic beast Fedor was killed. . . .

Constantine's approval of such a cruel form of retribution underscores Fedor's abuses. Never before had the Metropolitan of Kiev treated one of his own prelates to such a bloodbath. The description of the dismembering of Fedor's person follows a long rationalization for such an inglorious penalty. He was the incarnation of the evil which had disrupted the peace between the churches of Kiev and Rostov-Suzdal' since the deposition of Nestor in 1156. Overthrown by the citizens of Rostov and brutally executed by order of the Metropolitan of Kiev, Fedor encountered the wrath of the

two powers which his Prince had set out to undermine. The murder of Fedor constituted an irremediable blow to Bogoljubskij's struggle for Vladimir's ecclesiastical supremacy.[61] Andrej was white-washed in the accounts of this episode, but Fedor's disgrace was his own.

News of Andrej's complicity with Fedor may possibly have spread to other parts of *Rus'*. Cyril, the well-known Bishop of Turov, appears to have abandoned his usual otherworldly posture to deliver a sermon on this unfortunate alliance. We are told in the *Prologue Life of Cyril* that "he wrote many epistles to Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij concerning the writings of the Gospels and the Prophets and commentaries on divine holidays and many other sermons of spiritual use."[62] This biography also alludes to Cyril's condemnation of "Fedorec, the heretical bishop, for his most offensive sin."[63] Among Cyril's many admonitions to Andrej was, possibly, the "Sermon on Man's Body and Soul, on the Breaking of the Divine Commandment, on the Resurrection of the Human Body, on the Future Judgment, and on Penance."[64] In this sermon Cyril used the oriental legend of the lame and the blind man to illustrate his point. The legend concerns a landlord who hired a lame man and a blind man to watch over his vineyard, calculating that each was too incapacitated to steal from his vineyard. But the watchmen outsmarted their landlord: the lame man sat upon the shoulders of the blind man, reached over the vineyard wall, and made off with some grapes. When confronted by their master, however, they accused one another and both were punished for their sins. Cyril comments that the master symbolized God; the vineyard, all worldly goods; the vineyard wall, the Lord's commandments; and the blind man, the soul.[65] Although Cyril never specifically alluded to Andrej and Fedor in this sermon, it is usually assumed that he referred therein to the collaboration of Andrej, the lame man, with Fedor, the blind man. The chronicles provide no explanation for Cyril's alleged hostility toward Andrej, although Andrej's possession of Turov in 1150[66] might have generated some antipathy. Should Cyril have been alluding to Andrej and Fedor, the suggestion that this unholy alliance would come to an inglorious end could imply that Cyril was well aware of the impracticality as well as the immorality of Andrej's ecclesiastical pretensions.

Fedor's death preceded Andrej's equally gruesome murder by about five years. Just as political pressures led to the Prince's demise, so forces within the church led to Fedor's. After 1169 Prince Andrej made no further efforts to combat the coalition which Kiev and Rostov mounted against his challenge. If Nestor and then Fedor were his favorites, Leon was the Prince's arch antagonist who secured the combined loyalties of lay and ecclesiasti-

cal potentates of the Rostov episcopal see, of the metropolitanate and of the patriarchate. Leon remained Bishop of Rostov and retained control of Andrej's church. Despite his ecclesiastical contributions Andrej Bogoljubskij could not control his church. His venture into the vineyard, if such was the message of Cyril of Turov's sermon, met with divine retribution through the ministration of Metropolitan Constantine.

Yet the persistent and uncompromising commitment to the ecclesiastical supremacy of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma yielded one significant change. Andrej's chosen city came to be recognized as a *bona fide* cathedral city. Patriarch Luke did concede to the Prince that "if a bishop comes to desire to stay there with you, well, then, let the God-loving bishop be with you . . . because this city is (already) under his jurisdiction."[67] And although Bishop Leon apparently chose otherwise, his immediate or nearly immediate successor probably exploited the Patriarch's concession. The next bishop mentioned in the *Laurentian Chronicle*, another Luke, was called "Bishop of Rostov, Vladimir, and Suzdal' and all the Rostov Land."[68] Luke filled this office during the reign of Andrej's half-brother and successor Vsevolod, whose political and ecclesiastical policies suggest compromise with Kiev and the development of Vladimir as the new center of the Rostov Land. Vladimir had become an officially acknowledged cathedral city, far less significant than the ambitious Bogoljubskij desired, but, unbeknownst to Bogoljubskij, on its way toward the acclaim of two centuries later when it would indeed replace Kiev as the nominal center of the Russian metropolitanate.

Part Two:
The Myth

III

The Holy Prince of the Bogoljubskij *Svod*

We turn now from a study of policy and achievement to a study of myth and ideology. Andrej's supporters composed a highly stylized and idealized history of the reign which transformed the Prince from deviant into saint and interpreted every endeavor and every accomplishment as an inspiration of the gods. The Bogoljubskij *svod* (compilation) sacralized the reign of Prince Andrej and elevated the events of his everyday life into the deeds of a semi-divine hero.

Historians of the oldest Russian historical writings generally argue that Prince Andrej himself commissioned the compilation of a chronicle of the history of *Rus'* to conclude with his reign. Whereas earlier compilations were written in Kiev, they argue, the hypothetical Bogoljubskij compilation was composed in Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma. Work on this redaction was interrupted by the untimely death of its sponsor in 1175 and was not completed until after the accession of Vsevolod III in 1177.[1] Like the Bogoljubskij compilation, that of 1177 is no longer extant.

The *Laurentian Chronicle* contains the oldest and most faithful "edition" of the Bogoljubskij *svod*[2]; the *Hypatian Chronicle* parallels most of the *Laurentian* account, but its inclusion of inimical comments about Andrej's policies renders less useful for a study of his official ideology all of its deviations from the *Laurentian* version. In one very crucial respect, however, the *Hypatian Chronicle* is indispensable to an analysis of the portraits of Prince Andrej written by his chroniclers: it contains an elaborate "Narration" (*Skazanie*) on the Prince's murder which was not included in the *Laurentian Chronicle*, but which appears to have been the work of an admiring Vladimirite contemporary.[3]

Analysis of the chronicle accounts of Prince Andrej's reign can be most conveniently divided into three sections: (a) the early years in Kiev; (b) the reign in Vladimir; and (c) murder and martyrdom. Each section poses its own problems of dating and authorship and presents differing, but complementary images of Prince Andrej. Focus on the dating and authorship has

resulted, unfortunately, in neglect of the substance of the portraits. The pages which follow dwell mostly on that substance.

a. The Early Years in Kiev

The first references to Prince Andrej in the *Hypatian* and *Laurentian Chronicles* concern the military assistance he gave his father Jurij during his wars with Izjaslav of Volhynia over Kiev. Between 1149 and 1152 Andrej appears as protagonist in a number of entries. The central position which Andrej occupies in these articles and their inclusion in both the *Hypatian* and *Laurentian Chronicles* have provoked considerable discussion as to the time and place of their composition. Two hypotheses have been put forward. The first theory suggests that they were composed before 1155 in or around Kiev for inclusion in Jurij Dolgorukij's *svod.* According to this view, Bogoljubskij had nothing to do with their composition and entries concerning him were possibly included in the 1177 *svod* as a result of an editorial decision taken after his murder. The other hypothesis suggests that these articles were composed in Vladimir during Bogoljubskij's life at his own request after his permanent settlement in that city and were subsequently transmitted south to Kiev for inclusion in the *svod* of 1200. Nasonov has been the leading proponent of the first hypothesis, arguing that Andrej's frequent appearance in these entries resulted from his actual role as Jurij's military assistant ("*pomoščnik v voennom dele*"), after the fashion of Mstislav, who had assisted in the wars sponsored by his father Monomax.[4] Šaxmatov, Priselkov, and Limonov, on the other hand, support the second hypothesis.[5]

The second hypothesis is more plausible. Limonov has correctly observed that in these passages Andrej acts not as a military assistant but rather as a junior prince with a mind of his own. Often Andrej challenges the opinions of Prince Jurij and the judgment of the son seems of greater value than that of the father. It is possible, too, that a cleric of the Church of the Dormition composed these passages, given their thematic connection with the succeeding accounts of Bogoljubskij's reign in Vladimir. It is equally possible, however, that a cleric favorably disposed to Prince Andrej composed the entries while the Prince was still in the south and that they were then transported to Vladimir in 1157. Whatever their provenance, these passages form a significant part of the political ideology we associate with the contemporary chronicling of Prince Andrej's rule.

In the first entry of this period (s.a. 1149) one finds Prince Andrej helping his father Jurij to take control of Kiev from Izjaslav Mstislavič. A battle

takes place near Lutsk, on the westernmost border of the Kiev Land, where Izjaslav's troops were stationed. Andrej's chronicler describes his hero's role in the resolution of this conflict:[6]

> Rostislav Jur'evič and his brother Andrej marched in front, together with the Polovci. They stationed themselves at the Muravica River. There was a terrible fright that night and the Polovci retreated with their commander Žiroslav. Andrej remained forward and his brother Rostislav stood behind him. Rostislav summoned his brother to him, but Andrej disregarded the summons, choosing to endure the terrible fright. His retinue approached and pleaded with him, saying, "What are you doing, Prince? Come at once or we'll be in trouble." But Andrej disregarded them, placing his hope in God. Shortly before dawn Andrej saw all the Polovci run away. He praised the Lord, Who gave him strength and he went to his brother and to the Polovci princes who had gathered to him.

We read later in the description of the battle:[7]

> Rostislav, Boris and Mstislav did not understand the design of their brother Andrej — to attack the (enemy) infantry — because they saw that his troops were unwilling to fight. Andrej did not boast in the strength of his weapons; he sought praises from God alone. Thus with the help of God, the strength of the Holy Cross and the prayers of his ancestors, Andrej advanced upon the enemy before all; his retinue went after him.

In the above passages the chronicler describes Andrej's special relationship with God, with Christ and with his ancestral line, all of whom fortify him and inform his battle strategy. The other sons of Jurij function on a more secular plane. Their reasoning could not fathom the behavior of their brother, whose military insight stemmed from a supernatural source.

The next section of the 1149 article reveals Andrej's extraordinary, nearly supernatural talents on the battlefield:[8]

> He broke his spear in combat. The footsoldiers ran along the trench back into the town and he chased after them . . . Only two of his lesser retinue saw their Prince fall into great misfortune, for he was surrounded by soldiers. The two chased after him. His horse was pierced by two spears. A third fell into the pommel of his saddle. Stones were hurled like rain from the town. One foreigner [Hungarian or Pole] spotted him and wanted to attack him with a boar-spear, but the Lord preserved him. For oftentimes He endangers the life of His beloved ones on the battlefield and saves them according to His mercy. Andrej meditated and said to himself in his heart: "May I die as Izjaslav Jaroslavič died." He prayed to the Lord and withdrew his sword. . . . Because of his faith the Lord preserved him without harm. . . . Only one member of the lesser retinue with Andrej was

> killed. His father Jurij and his father's brother Vjačeslav and all his brothers rejoiced when they saw him alive. His father's knights praised him greatly, for he was braver than all others who were there. His horse was badly wounded; it had carried its master and then expired. Andrej was stricken with grief over his horse and ordered it buried above the Styr' River.

What Andrej's kinsmen recognized as knightly bravery (*muž'sky stvori*) the chronicler attributes to divine inspiration.

After the battle at Lutsk Izjaslav Mstišlavič declares a truce, acknowledges his mistakes and approaches Jurij to swear an oath of peace. The chronicler assigns Andrej a special role in persuading his father to accept Izjaslav's overtures:[9]

> And the Lord, Who was merciful to His people, especially to Christians, dwelled in the heart of Andrej, who began to plead with his father, saying, ". . . Be reconciled with your nephew (Izjaslav). Do not destroy your fatherland."

Andrej's divinely inspired entreaties lead Izjaslav and Jurij to take the oath.

The 1149 episode presents Andrej in two contradictory postures — valiant warrior and prince of peace. Both postures underscore the special role which Andrej played at this time vis-à-vis his father, whom he served in battle in spite of his yearning for peace. As loyal son he was obliged to fight for Jurij's control of Kiev. As loyal Christian and lover of his land he was bound to search for peaceful coexistence with his brethren. A closer look at the above passages suggests a resolution of this apparent contradiction. Andrej spares most of his kinsmen from involvement in armed combat. His naive insistence on fighting without support is revealed to have been the most effective tactic for the preservation of peace. The Prince defends himself once Izjaslav attacks, but he himself does not attack. He maintains a lonely all-night vigil and the next day withstands the enemy onslaught, never killing anyone, but defending himself and thereby stopping the war. The soldier-warrior Andrej is highly stylized and idealized. He is not the shrewd, militant junior prince calculating the odds in order to achieve victory for the senior ruler. Rather, he is a fearless Christian warrior who responds to a divine calling. Andrej engages in "preventive warfare"; he fights for peace among his kin.

The image of the prince presented in the 1149 episode recalls that of Vladimir Monomax. Like Andrej, Monomax performed extraordinary acts of daring. He performed them without the support of his army, placing hope, as would his successor Andrej, in God alone. He states in his "Testa-

ment": "I was many times saved from all distress through His mercy and through the prayers of my father."[10] Like Andrej, Monomax relied upon the intercession of the princes of his lineage and upon the Lord Himself who "preserved me unharmed."[11] And like Andrej, Monomax exhibited extraordinary independence from worldly assistance:[12]

> Without relying on lieutenants or messengers I did whatever was necessary. I do not commend my own boldness, but I praise God and glorify His memory because He has guarded me, a sinful and wretched man, for so many years in these dangerous vicissitudes.

Admonishing his sons to preserve peace and brotherly love, Monomax recognized the necessity for less pleasant activity, saying "do a man's work as God sets it before you."[13] Similarly, Andrej accepts his duty to his father, supports him and does God's work as a loyal son.

Andrej remained in west *Rus'* after the battle of Lutsk at least through the following year, assisting his father in the protection of this area from attacks by the combined forces of Izjaslav and his Polish and Hungarian allies. The chronicler discusses Andrej's fortification of the towns of west *Rus'* and his negotiations with his father's arch enemy:[14]

> The holiday of the Translation of the Holy Cross came to pass and he (Andrej) was in the Church of St. Michael... That fall his father awarded him the regions of Pinsk, Turov, Dorogobuž and Peresopnica. Andrej bowed in consent to his father and went to reside at Peresopnica. That winter Izjaslav started sending messages to Andrej, saying, "Brother, lead me to your father in peace." But while making these peace overtures to Andrej, Izjaslav looked over Andrej's troops and the fortifications of the town. Formerly, before his brother Gleb left Peresopnica, Andrej observed the same thing happening. Andrej did not overlook Izjaslav's designs and consequently strengthened the town's defense and gathered his retinue.

Here again Andrej is portrayed as a loyal and vigilant son. And here, too, the tension is present — he wages a defensive campaign and is invited by his father's enemy to negotiate peace.

In 1151, again in Jurij's support, Andrej acts heroically on the battlefield, this time on the Lybed' River near Kiev. The chronicler displays his extraordinary courage in the face of serious obstacles. Despite the cowardice of his retinue and the Polovci, Andrej decides to fight the enemy "preserved and fortified by the Lord and the prayers of his ancestors."[15] Several days later, with the odds overwhelmingly in Izjaslav's favor, Andrej takes the lead of his father's troops and commences fighting:[16]

> Andrej began to organize his father's troops because he was at that time the eldest of the brothers. He observed that the Polovci stood back and approached them. He spoke with them at great length and fortified them for the battle. And the troops marched out from there strengthened. He took his retinue and his spear and marched in front, advancing before all. He broke his spear. Then his horse was wounded in the nose and began to waver. His helmet fell off his head and his shield was pulled off. But through the intervention of the Lord and the prayers of his ancestors he was preserved without a wound.

At the end of the Battle of Lybed' and the ensuing encounter between Izjaslav and Jurij at Perejaslavl' a truce is declared. During the negotiations Andrej urges his father to preserve the peace and to heed Izjaslav's stipulation that he retire to his native Suzdal'. When Jurij refuses, Andrej "went to his region (*volost'*) Vladimir."[17]

Andrej's behavior during the events of 1151 closely parallels his conduct two years earlier at Lutsk. He excels in battle despite the cowardice of his troops. God's chosen warrior, he fights valiantly for his stubborn, bellicose father and then begs for the preservation of peace. His resolve to withdraw to Suzdal' anticipates his subsequent decision to abandon the political instability of Kiev for the tranquility of his homeland. The 1151 episode underscores the mounting tension of this period of Andrej's life; whereas in 1149 he yields to the wishes of his father and submits to Jurij's request that he remain in southern *Rus'*, by 1151 he already begins to defy him by withdrawing to the northeast.

b. The Reign in Vladimir

Once in Vladimir the conflict of loyalties is transcended. No longer does Andrej heed the calling of his father, but rather the calling of God. The account of his reign[18] begins with his departure from Vyšegorod, the town ceded to him by Jurij Dolgorukij when he took Kiev from Izjaslav Mstislavič in 1155. Andrej's chronicler avoids elaborate discussion of the defiance of tradition which the departure implied. He glosses over the antipathy between father and son to which the *Hypatian Chronicle* alludes[19] and stresses instead the Prince's obedience to a higher authority. Just as during his minority Andrej responded to a higher law and therefore disregarded the advice of his peers, so now, the chronicler implies, his abandonment of southern *Rus'* is not so much an act of disobedience as the fulfillment of a sacred duty. On his journey from Vyšegorod to Suzdal' the

Prince is accompanied by an icon of the Virgin which came from the holy city of Constantinople:[20]

> he [Andrej] took along the icon of the holy Virgin which had been brought from Tsargrad . . . He placed on it 30 coins (*grivni*) of gold and silver and precious stones and gems. He decorated it and placed it in his church in Vladimir.

By associating the translation of power from Kiev to the northeast with the translation of a Byzantine icon of the Virgin, the chronicler conveys the spiritual significance of the move. The Byzantine icon transforms the journey into a pilgrimage and the beginning of the reign into a fulfillment of a divine ordinance.[21]

The Virgin's intervention in the Prince's behalf is central to the account of the reign.[22] Every act is sacralized through her beneficent intercession. The chronicler introduces the reign with a display of princely benefactions in the Virgin's behalf. We learn first of the lands and funds he donated to the church where the icon was placed.[23] Two years later we learn that the church was completed and decorated:[24]

> In that year the Church of the Holy Mother of God of Vladimir was completed by the pious (*blagovernym'*) and God-loving (*bogoljubivym'*) Prince Andrej.[25] He decorated it splendidly with many varied icons, and innumerable precious stones and church vessels. And he gilded the domes. Because of his faith and his pious devotion to the Holy Virgin, God led to him craftsmen from all lands; and he decorated it more than all others.[26]

The chronicler's portrait of Andrej as an outstanding churchman even included comparisons with the Emperor of Byzantium. The most explicit comparison occurs s.a. 1164, when Andrej admonishes the upstart Bishop Leon. This passage was quoted at length in the preceding chapter.[27] Here Andrej acts as arbiter in ecclesiastical matters. His opposition to Leon is based on the "orthodox" view of holiday fasting.[28] His judgment is reinforced by the judgment of "Tsar" Manuel. Prince and Emperor defend the faith against a common enemy. Imperial confirmation of Andrej's decision over church practices is witnessed by embassies from other princes of the realm — including that of the Prince of Kiev.

Andrej's involvement in the affairs of the Church of Vladimir is "imperial" in another context — the episode of the "lord" Fedor. Fedor, it will be recalled from a previous chapter, was Andrej's protégé and possible candidate for his proposed Metropolitanate of Vladimir; obsessed with his

own power, he was subsequently murdered by order of the Metropolitan of Kiev. When, according to the account of the chronicler, which we have reason to suspect,[29] Fedor reveals his true nature, Andrej acts as deliverer of his clergy and people from the evil of a "second Satan." The "Christ-loving" Prince saves his subjects from Fedor who is delivered to the church "by the strong hand, the high and pure and imperial (*carskoju*) hand of the just and pious Prince Andrej."[30]

The Prince's support of the church includes his role as military defender of the faith. His chronicler places him on the battlefield but once during the course of the reign. The 1164 entry concludes with a description of Andrej's most unequivocally Christian military victory — the defeat of the pagan (i.e. Islamic) Volga Bulgars:[31]

> In that year Prince Andrej attacked the Bulgars with his son Izjaslav, his brother Jaroslav and with Prince Jurij of Murom. And the Lord and the holy Virgin assisted them against the Bulgars. They destroyed a multitude of Bulgars and they took their banners. With great difficulty the Prince of the Bulgars fled with a small retinue to their Great City. Prince Andrej returned victoriously; he saw the pagan Bulgars slain and all his retinue intact. The footsoldiers stood with the icon of the Holy Virgin on the field beneath the banners. Approaching the icon and the infantry, Prince Andrej, with Jurij and Izjaslav and Jaroslav and his entire retinue, threw himself before the Holy Virgin and began to kiss her image with great joy and tears. They offered her praises and songs and then took their [the Bulgars'] glorious city Brjaximov. But first they burned three other towns. This was a new miracle of the icon of the Vladimir Virgin which the pious Prince had taken with him to battle. He brought it in glory and placed it in the Church of the Holy Virgin in Vladimir — the one with the golden domes, where it stands until this day.

Crusader against the infidel, Prince Andrej scores a stunning victory thanks to the intercession of his Holy Protectress. The Prince who had developed and fortified Vladimir brings glory to his Lord through a pious campaign. No longer does he fight with cowardly allies as he fought in Jurij's wars in the south. Now, together with his zealous compatriots, he prays, fights in a just battle, and scores a magnificent success. The icon has become his palladium and that of all his allies. Bogoljubskij is defender of his faith as military crusader.[32]

The Virgin also intervenes in her Prince's behalf in battles of less certain legitimacy. All of Andrej's campaigns profit from the Virgin's intercession — even the celebrated sack of Kiev in 1168 when Andrej sent his son Mstislav to ravage his rival city.[33] In this instance the success of the campaign against Kiev, planned by Andrej, is the unavoidable, if undesirable,

result of the sins of the Russian people, especially those of the Metropolitan who had unjustly punished Abbot Policarp for his view on the holiday fast.[34] Kiev deserves to be punished by Andrej, who acts as defender of Orthodox Christianity against his sinful kinsmen, as the instrument of God's revenge.

Andrej's chronicler is not unequivocally hostile to Kiev, for traditional attitudes still retain their grasp. If the city in its present state of unrest could provoke the wrath of God, its venerable past could move him to mercy. Hence, during the successful defense of Kiev against Cuman incursions which occurred in 1169 shortly after the city had been pillaged by Andrej's allies, the chronicler explains why Kiev, which had previously suffered at his hero's hands, was not spared:[35]

> In that year God wrought a miracle together with the Holy Virgin of the Church of the Tithe in Kiev which Vladimir built when he baptized the Russian land. And he gave a tithe of all the Russian land to this church. Through God's mercy a miracle beyond our hopes came to pass.

Kiev's successful defense against the Polovci in 1169 provided the occasion for the articulation of the image of the mother of Russian towns which Andrej so eagerly copied. His model was the old Kiev, the Virgin-protected city endowed by its first Prince with a tithe of his land.

The Virgin also intervened in Andrej's behalf in the struggle with Novgorod in 1169. The chronicler attributes even the failure of Andrej's troops to her intercession and to the "dignity of the pious hand of Prince Andrej."[36] Andrej, we are told, responded to the Virgin's entreaties and ordered his troops to refrain from taking Novgorod. The Novgorodians, to be sure, were sinners, but as God took pity on the people of Ninevah, so the Virgin showed mercy to them through the mediation of her pious Prince.

If Novgorod and Kiev housed sinners, the people of Vladimir were impeccable Christians thanks to the extraordinary piety of their Prince. Bogoljubskij's Vladimir, following in the tradition of its now sinful, if formerly pious rival city of Kiev, was the most Christian city of *Rus'*, the true successor of Kievan piety.

After the events of 1169 Andrej's chronicler is silent about the activities of his hero, whose reign was already approaching its tragic conclusion. The period of extensive church building was over, as were the successful campaigns against pagan and sinful Christian alike. The Vladimirite chronicler would hail once again the piety of Prince Andrej only when he came to record his violent end.

c. Murder and Martyrdom

The account of the murder of Prince Andrej provides the occasion for an official summing up of the reign. The murder inspired the composition of a posthumous portrait which epitomizes the image of the Prince. Both the *Hypatian* and *Laurentian* redactions introduce their accounts with a panegyric on the accomplishments of his reign and conclude with the religious and political implications of their hero's untimely death.[37] The two redactions are quite similar; but the *Hypatian* redaction (the *Narration*) is far more elaborate than its *Laurentian* counterpart (the *Tale*). The discrepancies between the two accounts have caused considerable debate as to which preceded the other. The prevailing view points to the primacy of the *Laurentian* version, assumed to have been composed directly after Vsevolod Jur'evič acquired power (c. 1177).[38] The *Hypatian* expansion, according to this theory, was composed somewhat later, probably in Kiev, for inclusion in the all-Russian compilation of 1200. Historians of this school point to the numerous references in the *Hypatian* account to Andrej's southern political predecessors and to the rather uncomplimentary descriptions of the instability in Vladimir after the murder. N. N. Voronin,[39] supported by Ju. A. Limonov,[40] has suggested an alternate hypothesis which I have made my own. He acknowledges the complexity of both accounts, and, pointing to the uniqueness of some passages in both accounts, suggests that probably both redactions were derived from a no longer extant archetype. He then suggests the relative primacy and authenticity of the *Hypatian* version with which most, but not all, of the *Laurentian* version overlaps. The *Laurentian* condensation, he argues, reveals the poverty of its author's skills through the distortion of the grammar and meaning of the longer version. The original tale was probably composed in Vladimir by one or more of the churchmen associated with the Church of the Virgin in that city — by Mikula the Priest, Kuzmišče Kjanin, the Abbot Arsenius, or the Abbot Feodul, all of whom took part in the events following upon Prince Andrej's death, according to the *Hypatian* account.[41] The *Hypatian* version, he notes, is filled with accurate details of building structures, and in any case seems too close to the event to have been the work of a later chronicler. Consequently, the original tale probably found its way south sometime after 1177 (Vsevolod Jur'evič is mentioned in the tale as the reigning Prince) and was more or less faithfully reproduced in the compilation of 1200.

For our purposes the most crucial aspect of Voronin's hypothesis is his

insistence on the fidelity of the *Hypatian* version to the missing archetype. To support this contention Voronin and Limonov point not only to the accurate detailing of the buildings and churches in Vladimir reflected in the *Narration*, but to parallels between this account and other ideological tracts of the period. Other evidence can be adduced in support of the authenticity of the *Narration* — namely, its thematic relationship to the chronicle account of Bogoljubskij's life. To be sure, Kievan influences abound. But they abound in the *Laurentian Tale*, too, as well as in the chronicling of Prince Andrej's life before and after he left the south. Consequently, there is no reason to assume that the Kievan flavor of the *Hypatian* version reveals its southern origin — that is, its composition in a region under the control of an opponent of the political claims of Vladimir. To be sure, some of the Vladimir clergy responsible for the *Narration* came from the south[42] and must have been schooled in the Kievan chronicle tradition. But this schooling was put to favorable use by Andrej throughout his life, and we have no cause to assume that Bogoljubskij would have opposed this account in any way had he been alive to see it. Therefore, because of its meticulously detailed description of the murder, its reliable descriptions of the churches built by Andrej and its thematic resemblance to the earlier (*Laurentian*) chronicling of his life, the *Hypatian* version is assumed here to be closer to the common source.

If one accepts the authenticity of both accounts, as Voronin does, the problem of the interrelationship can be set aside; one can go a step further and proceed to a study of the princely ideology reflected in both the *Narration* and in the *Tale*. The discussion below will focus on the *Narration* since it is much more detailed than the *Tale*. However, in every instance where the *Tale* includes passages relevant to the ideology, appropriate references to them will be made in the notes.

The chronicling of the murder of Prince Andrej is designed above all to justify the tragic conclusion of the reign. The *Narration* begins with a panegyric on the Prince's achievements which commences in the customary style with legitimizing references to Prince Andrej's ancestry: "In that year Grand Prince Andrej, son of Jurij, grandson of Monomax was murdered."[43] He then adduces the following comparison:[44] "He (Andrej) created a stone city for himself called Bogoljubovo. And as far as Vyšegorod was from Kiev, so far was Bogoljubovo from Vladimir." In a later passage one discovers that Vladimir itself was designed to resemble Kiev: among its fortifications were Golden and Silver Gates and among its churches was its principal church of the Virgin of Vladimir.[45] The Prince was heralded first and foremost for the creation of a holy city.

As Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma was a second Kiev, so Andrej was the successor of the holiest princes of Kiev. Vladimir Svjatoslavič arranged for the care of the poor and the sick each Sunday by sending a wagon around Kiev loaded with bread, meat, fish, mead and kvass.[46] And so does Andrej:[47]

> He ordered that every day food and various beverages be distributed in the city among the sick and the poor on demand. And beholding every poor person who approached him he gave to him whatever was requested, saying "Did not Christ come to feed me?" Thus he received everyone who approached him.

Andrej is even superior to his model. Whereas Vladimir ordered wagons to be driven about Kiev, Andrej personally attended to the sick and the poor, not just on Sundays, but every day.

If Andrej is merciful after the fashion of St. Vladimir, he is pious and wise like Jaroslav the Wise. As Jaroslav was a new Solomon who built the Church of Holy Wisdom "with gold and silver and churchly vessels,"[48] so Andrej is a second wise Solomon who builds his Virgin-dedicated church of those same materials. According to the *Narration* Andrej built several churches worthy of comparison to Solomon's Holy of Holies in Jerusalem. The longest single passage of the eulogy to Andrej concerns this comparison:[49]

> From his youth the pious and Christ-loving Prince Andrej loved Christ and His Most Immaculate Mother. He was intelligent and his mind was adorned like a beautiful palace with all good traits. He resembled Tsar Solomon who created the House of the Lord when he created the marvelous stone Church of the Virgin Birth in the middle of the town of Bogoljubovo. He made it splendid more than all other churches; like the Holy of Holies which the most wise Tsar Solomon created, this pious Prince created this church in his own memory. He decorated it with many valuable icons, with gold, precious stones and magnificent, invaluable gems . . . All the church was golden . . . All who saw it could not describe its extraordinary beauty . . . , decorated as it was with all churchly vessels and golden vessels and precious stones and invaluable *ripidia* and candleholders. Within the Church from the ceiling to the floor and along the walls and the pillars there was gold. And the doors and lintels of the Church were covered with gold. And the canopy was decorated with gold from the top to the Deesis . . .

In a similar fashion the chronicler describes the Cathedral of the Dormition in Vladimir:[50]

> He decorated it with all different designs of gold and silver. He gilded the five domes and built the three church doors of gold. He decorated the church with precious stones and many valuable gems and made it splendid with all kinds of decorations. He brightened the church with many gold and silver candelabra. He built the pulpit of gold and silver. He endowed the church with many service cups and *ripidia*. The entire church structure was of gold and precious stones. There were very many great jewels. He built three very great reliquaries from pure gold and many precious stones. And from all views the church was built like the wonderful Holy of Holies of Solomon . . . And inside the church and along the vaults were golden birds and vials.

The chronicler's concern with the generous supply of gold in the churches of Bogoljubovo and Vladimir can be explained in part by the comparison with the temple of King Solomon, which, according to the Second Book of Chronicles, was generously decorated with gold. The Byzantine chronicler Georgius Hamartolus devoted a lengthy passage of his *Chronicle* to the gold overlays of the temple of Solomon; since by 1177 this *Chronicle* was available in a Slavic translation, it, too, may have inspired Andrej's chronicler.[51]

Whatever the source of our chronicler's inspiration, it is clear that Andrej, like Emperor Justinian himself, is depicted as an emulator of a Biblical model. He chose to associate himself with the archetypal builder of a new Jerusalem. And in the above passages, Andrej once again outshines his Russian prototype, being more like Solomon than his kinsman Jaroslav.[52]

Only the blind and impious could disregard the sublime achievements of the reign. Andrej's murderers are the ultimate demonic heroes, more sinful than all the squabbling brothers to the south. Yet these Judases of the princely court perform an act which ultimately enhances Andrej's power and ensures the preservation of the new sacred city. They transform their prince into a martyr, into a passion-sufferer (*strastoterpec'*), whose bloody death bears final witness to the higher authority which had directed all of Andrej's previous endeavors in his people's behalf. The victim of a ghastly political crime, Andrej comes to be numbered among the holy martyrs who reign eternally with Christ.

Several times during the course of the *Narration* the Prince is associated with his Kievan ancestors, the passion-sufferers Boris and Gleb. For example, "You have accepted, Prince Andrej, martyrdom for His namesake and you have followed the blessed and wise brothers, the holy passion-

sufferers."[53] And later, "together with his brothers Roman and David [the baptismal names of Boris and Gleb] he runs to Christ the Lord."[54] During the murder scene, Andrej, at first seeking to defend himself, reaches in vain for his missing sword, "the sword which had belonged to the holy Boris."[55] Confronting his murderers, Andrej notes their similarity to Gorjaser,[56] one of the plotters of Gleb's murder. Like the earlier Russian passion-sufferers, Andrej meets death from demonic murderers, compared in both cases to Satan. Although resistant at first, Andrej accepts his plight and asks to be received into the martyr's choir like his ancestor Boris.[57] The reward is granted him because, like the passion-sufferers in whose steps he followed, "this God-loving prince lay down his soul not for a friend, but for the Creator Himself Who created all things from non-being into being."[58]

To underscore the assertion that even the murder was a divinely inspired act the chronicler makes several references to the Byzantine "tsar." Just before succumbing Andrej prays to the Lord to help him accept his passion and to receive him "like the holy orthodox tsars whose blood flowed as they suffered for their people."[59] The identical request was made by Prince Igor Ol'govič in 1147 before he, like Andrej, became a victim of a political crime.[60] Like Igor, Andrej emulates the piety of the Byzantine tsar. In his description of the pillaging of Vladimir after the murder, the chronicler again alludes to the Byzantine tsar. Saint Paul and "Chrysostom" are quoted in order to warn the troublesome foes of the continuing power of the deceased Prince:[61]

> As the apostle Paul says: "Every soul obeys the ruler, for the rulers are established by God." (Rom. 13, 1-2). "In his earthly being, the tsar is like every man, but in his power he has the rank of God," spoke the great Chrysostom. "Those who oppose the ruler oppose the law of God." (Rom. 13, 2).

The segment of the above passage attributed to Chrysostom is actually a citation from the sixth century Byzantine ecclesiastic Agapetus, whose political wisdom appeared a century earlier in the 1076 *Izbornik Svjatoslava*.[62] The words of Chrysostom and Saint Paul reinforce the divine aspects of the late Prince Andrej. In his office and in his role as creator of a new Jerusalem-like city, we are told that the Prince never dies.

The chronicler concludes his account of the reign with a description of Andrej's funeral procession:[63]

> The people of Vladimir said to Feodul the Abbot and to Luka the *domesticos* of the Church of the Virgin: "Prepare the carriers so that we

> may go and carry the Prince and our lord Andrej." And they asked Mikula to gather all the priests dressed in liturgical garments, to go out before the Silver Gates with the icon of the Virgin and there to await the Prince. Feodul, the Abbot of the Church of the Virgin of Vladimir, did their bidding; he went after the Prince in Bogoljubovo with the clergy and the people of Vladimir. They took his body and brought it to Vladimir with honor and a great wail . . . The entire city prepared his body for burial . . . and placed it in the miraculous, praiseworthy, golden-domed Church of the Holy Virgin which he himself created.

The sacred journey is completed. The Prince rests in his eternal city.

Thus ends the chronicling of the reign of Andrej Jurevič Bogoljubskij. Piety and devotion to God, the Virgin and the sacred traditions of Kiev cause the Lord to "preserve him unharmed" for another, loftier mission to be fulfilled only after acceding to the throne in Vladimir in 1157. There, with the aid of the Empress of the Heavens, he develops a new religious center reminiscent of the old Kiev, whose claim to primacy lapsed with the onset of internecine wars and religious laxity. The devil grows jealous of Andrej's achievements and subjects him to an ugly and untimely death. Thus Andrej becomes a passion-sufferer to reign forever with Christ and to protect his Jerusalem-like city from all evil. The martyr Andrej dies that Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma can survive. To Prince and city are granted a touch of eternity.

IV

The Miraculous Voyage to the Promised Land

Prince Andrej's journey from Vyšegorod to Vladimir was a critical act: never again would the senior Rurikid prince necessarily reign in Kiev. Ironically, we know little about the circumstances surrounding the Prince's resolve to abandon the Kievan Land. Perhaps we should attribute our ignorance to the critical character of the journey. In any case, as noted in the previous chapter, Andrej's chronicler is conspicuously terse about the entire affair. Aside from a brief reference to the abandonment of his father ("he went from his father to Suzdal'"),[1] the political implications of the journey are left to the reader's imagination. The chronicler is far more informative about the spiritual dimensions of the voyage. He tells us that the Prince did not travel alone: he was accompanied by an icon of the Mother of God.[2] It was not just any icon, the chronicler adds, but one which had come from Tsargrad.[3]

The role of this icon during the course of Prince Andrej's historic journey is the central theme of one of the most interesting ideological tracts of the Bogoljubskij school: *The Narration of Miracles of the Vladimirite Icon of the Mother of God* (*Skazanie o čudesax vladimirskoj ikony božiej materi*).[4] The *Narration* describes the manifold ways in which the icon tenderly protected Andrej and his entourage during the course of the journey and throughout the reign in the Rostov Land. The work transforms the journey into a pilgrimage and the Prince into the messiah of a new promised land.

The *Narration* is usually dated to the twelfth century. The best extant manuscript, edited and published by Ključevskij, is contained in the seventeenth-century *Miljutin Menology*.[5] The orthography and language, however, hark back to a significantly earlier original. Specific references to clothing and to architectural monuments support the case for an early dating. V. O. Ključevskij suggested a date between 1164 and 1185, basing the former on a reference to the golden gates of Vladimir built in 1164, and the latter on a reference to the then still-standing Church of the Virgin of

Vladimir which burned to the ground in 1185.[6] N. N. Voronin confirmed Ključevskij's dating and adduced further evidence in its support. A reference to the narthex of the Church of the Virgin of Vladimir which burned in the fire of 1185 and was never replaced contributes to the likelihood that the *Narration* was written before the fire.[7] Voronin suggested a dating in the mid-sixties of the twelfth century — that is, at the peak of Andrej's power. Limonov suggested the later sixties.[8] The *Narration* is strikingly similar to other writings of the period, as will be demonstrated below, and thus it seems fairly safe to assign it to the period of the sixties.

Conjecture is on record concerning the author of the *Narration* as well. Ključevskij noted that someone very close to the events described must have written the *Narration*, possibly Mikula the Priest.[9] I. E. Zabelin suggested that Andrej himself wrote it.[10] Voronin attributed the work to a group of writers — the priests Lazarus, Nestor and Mikula, all of whom play roles in the *Narration*. He also speculated that Prince Andrej himself may have functioned as "chairman of the board."[11] The present writer prefers to be cautious, distrusts the theory of writing by committee, and simply ascribes the work to one of the learned clergy affiliated with the Prince.

The *Narration* begins with a comparison between the icon and the universal illumination of the rays of the sun:[12]

> When God created the sun he did not locate it in a single place. Thus, when it shines, it covers the entire world which it illuminates with its rays. Likewise, the Image of Our Most Pure Lady and Mother of God, the Eternal Virgin Mary, is the source of miracles and cures not for a single place, but for all countries. It illuminates the entire world and saves it from manifold misfortunes.

Thus we are prepared at the outset for the Virgin's benevolent sun-like concern for many people in many places. If her icon had worked miracles and cures in Kiev, it could, in theory, perform the same feats in any other land of its choice. Sacred space is not confined to the original Russian habitat of the holy image of Tsargrad.

The extension of divine protection to the new Russian lands is rationalized in similar terms in several other writings associated with the reign of Prince Andrej. The sun's coverage of the entire world is mentioned in the *Hypatian* account of Andrej's murder in essentially the same words as the first sentence of the quotation above.[13] And the parallel between the sun's rays and the illuminating quality of the icon calls to mind another work of the reign, the *Service Hymn to the Virgin's Intercession* (*Služba na*

Pokrov), in which the Virgin's radiant garment (*pokrov*) brought from Jerusalem to the Church of the Blachernae in Constantinople is compared to the sun.[14] Christianity is limited neither to a particular place nor to a particular time. There is ample precedent for Andrej's spiritual journey, for God is on the side of transition and change.

Next the *Narration* discusses the restlessness of the sacred image in the Kiev Land. And not only the icon seeks to move:[15]

> Prince Andrej wanted to be prince (knjažiti) in the Rostov Land. He began to inquire about icons. He was told of the Icon of the Most Holy Mother of God in the Nunnery of Vyšegorod — how it departed from its resting place three times. It happened the first time when they (the witnesses) entered the Church and beheld it standing by itself in the middle of the Church; they replaced it. The second time they saw it with its face turned toward the altar. They said "It wishes to stand in the altar space." And they placed it behind the altar table. The third time they saw it standing by itself on the side of the altar table; and they saw a multitude of miracles. When he heard these tidings the Prince (Andrej) was gladdened and went into the Church. He began to look over the icons. Now the aforesaid Icon excelled over all the others. When he saw it, he fell upon his knees and prayed, saying: "O Most Holy Virgin and Mother of Christ Our Lord, Thou shalt be my defender (*zastupnica*) in the Rostov Land. Come and visit the newly enlightened people so that all this may happen according to Thy will." And he took the Icon and went to the Rostov Land. He took some clergymen with him.

The icon miraculously moves about the Church of the Nunnery at Vyšegorod — the town awarded to Andrej in 1149 by his father Jurij and the town he would voluntarily leave shortly thereafter. The Prince, anticipating his journey, inquires of the whereabouts of an icon which he might take along to safeguard his mission. He learns that one exists which is unhappy in its present abode, and he is drawn to the church which houses it. He intuits the icon's willingness to accompany him, and prince, icon, and clergy proceed to the promised land.

Parts of the above passage closely parallel other ideological tracts of the reign. Especially striking is the similarity between Andrej's plea that the icon come and be the *zastupnica* of the Rostov Land and Andrej's prayer in the *Prologue Narration of the Intercession* (*Proložnoe skazanie Pokrova*) in which he beseeches the Virgin for protection (*zastuplenie*) of his flock.[16] The image of the newly enlightened Christians of Andrej's principality is more fully developed in the *Life of Leontius of Rostov* (*Žitie Leontija Rostovskogo*), another product of the Prince's political mythology.[17] The

theme of the newly enlightened, of course, was a topos in the Kievan literary tradition.

On the journey to Vladimir the icon protects Andrej and his fellow travellers. Immediately the voyagers and their chosen path are threatened by the destructive forces of nature. One of the most dramatic episodes to confront Prince Andrej and his entourage concerns the near drowning of their guide:[18]

> Along the way Andrej took a guide. As they approached the Vozuza River, Andrej observed that the waters were very high. He sent the guide to the River to try for a ford. But when the guide entered the River upon his horse, he sank to the bottom. The Prince began to pray to the Icon of Our Most Pure Lady and Mother of God, saying: "I will be responsible for this man's death if You do not save him." He prayed for awhile and then the man emerged from the middle of the River on his horse with his whip in his hand and came to the shore. The Prince rejoiced, gave the man gifts, and sent him on his way.

The journey to Vladimir is placed in serious jeopardy when the Prince's guide narrowly escapes death. A river has to be forded and the most artful arranger of the deed seems incapable of carrying it off. The Prince venerates the icon and the Virgin intercedes in his behalf. The obstacle is overcome and the voyage can continue. The Prince cries out to his protectress about his personal responsibility for the life of the guide. His prayers are heeded with the miraculous ascent of the pathfinder from the Vozuza River. Divine intervention rescues the mission from the disastrous waters which threaten to obstruct it, and the Virgin alleviates the Prince's burden of responsibility for the guide as she raises him up from the dead. The miraculous voyage continues, fused with optimistic expectation about the life to come in Vladimir.

Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma is reached and immediately Prince Andrej provides the icon with a new resting place:[19]

> They came to Vladimir and the noble (*blagorodnyj*) Prince Andrej built a church in the name of the Most Holy Virgin. He adorned it with all piety. And he placed in the Church the Icon of the Most Holy Lady Our Mother of God.

If the icon had been restless in Vyšegorod, it is content in the Church of the Virgin of Vladimir which Andrej builds and adorns in its honor.

Ensconced in Vladimir, the icon continues to perform miracles in the Prince's behalf. Andrej's role in the latter part of the *Narration* changes

from a princely pilgrim concerned for the well-being of his entourage to a special member of the congregation of the icon's church. Together with the citizens of Vladimir and neighboring Christians, Andrej profits from the presence of the wonder-working image. In one instance a man, stricken with an incurable illness leaving him lame and dumb, beckons with his right arm to be brought to the famous church. He watches the icon approach him and is instantly cured. Andrej, we are told, was in the church at the time.[20]

In the account of this miracle Andrej acts as an earthly intercessor for his subjects: although he never carries the icon, a prerogative confined exclusively to the clergy, he functions like the clergy in his capacity as intercessor with the Virgin. He is a Prince close to his subjects, concerned and responsible for the fate of even the lowliest among them. Andrej is credited with comparable benevolence in the *Tales* of his murder.[21]

On another occasion the Prince's presence in the Church of the Virgin leads to the successful delivery of one of his children:[22]

> After some time the Holiday of our Lord came to pass. Prince Andrej was in the Church for a service and the choir was singing songs. He was sad in his heart, for his princess was ill with childbirth. She idled in labor for two days. When the song ended, he sprinkled holy water on the Icon of the Virgin and sent the water to the Princess. She tasted the water and bore the child in a healthy manner. And she became well at that time because of the mercy of the Virgin.

The birth of the Prince's child, threatened by its mother's illness, is assured by the same process which preserved Andrej and his co-travellers from the obstacles set in their path. The Prince worships and prays in the icon's presence and the Virgin fulfills his wish. Now he becomes a benevolent, proximate father-figure, just as his protectress is an imminent, all-giving mother-figure. A child is born unto him and the continuity of the new holy family is assured.[23]

The *Tale* concludes with an account of the real death of twelve Vladimirites who are trapped beneath the collapsed gates of Vladimir:[24]

> The pious Prince Andrej built the Golden Gates in time for the holiday of the Holy Virgin, saying to the bojars: "When the people come down for the holiday they will see the gates." And the holiday came to pass and the people (*narod*) approached the gates. But the mortar in the gates had not yet set, and all of a sudden the gates separated from the walls and fell on the people, covering twelve men. When Prince Andrej heard this, he prayed with a sigh to the Icon of the Holy Virgin and Mother of God. "If You do not save these people, I, a sinner, will be responsible for their death." And he sent his bojar to prepare all things for the dead. And the

> bojar came and they lifted away the gates and beheld all those who had been under the gates alive and well. When Andrej heard this he rejoiced. The people saw this miracle and marvelled.

The prayers of the pious Prince are once again answered. The *Narration* now depicts Andrej as the builder of the new sacred city, as a Prince eager to celebrate the Virgin's protection of his sacred mission. His devotion to the splendor of Vladimir is temporarily undermined by the fear that he has caused the death of twelve of its inhabitants. Yet, thanks once again to the icon, the Vladimirites are saved, the Virgin's holiday is given its due, and all marvel at the miraculous spectacle of the resurrected twelve.

The icon and the Virgin herself play central roles in several other tales and holy writs composed during the reign of Prince Andrej. To these further articulations of Bogoljubskij ideology we shall turn in subsequent chapters. It is interesting to note as a postlude to this chapter, however, that Andrej's precious icon, especially its translation from Vyšegorod to Vladimir, caught the imagination of his Muscovite successors. Vasilij I and Metropolitan Kiprian retranslated the precious relic, according to Muscovite sources the creation of the Evangelist Luke, from Vladimir to Moscow in 1395 in one of the first "translation of empire" rituals to characterize the emergence of tsarist Russia.[25] As a result of this later miraculous voyage, the icon acquired its fame as "Our Lady of Vladimir" and exercised a strong influence on the painters of Muscovite schools.[26]

V

Defender of the Faith

Bogoljubskij bookmen cast their Prince as a peace-loving man. Loath to fight among his kin, they argue, when he had to do battle he relied upon others to do the fighting for him. Once during his reign, however, the Prince had to go to war — not a war among the princes of *Rus'*, but a defensive war against the Islamic infidel. This was the only unequivocally just war the peace-loving Prince could fight. And fight he did, in the year 1164, against the ravaging Volga Bulgars.

For the official chronicler of Prince Andrej's reign it was enough to affirm the uniqueness of the Bulgar encounter. But another of the Prince's literary supporters suggested much more. He transformed the pious Prince into a crusader and a co-worker with the Byzantine Tsar Manuel Comnenus. To the defeat of the Volga Bulgars in 1164 our anonymous author devoted a brief, but pithy, tract: *The Narration of the Defeat of the Bulgars* (*Skàzanie o pobede nad Bolgarami*). According to this tract, Prince and Tsar experience simultaneous victories over their pagan foes and resolve to proclaim a holiday in honor of the Savior, to be celebrated jointly every August first.

Before continuing our discussion of the text, it is necessary to enter some words of caution about its authenticity. The time of the composition of the *Bulgar Narration* is highly problematic; and the texts which have come down to us are replete with anachronisms which could not possibly hark back to a hypothetical prototype. Historians generally assign the work to the reign of Prince Andrej in spite of the disturbing truth that the earliest extant manuscript comes from the sixteenth century.[1] The probability that Prince Andrej ordered the composition of the original version of the *Bulgar Narration* is based on the following circumstantial evidence. There is a striking similarity between this text and the account of the battle of 1164 interpolated into the *Laurentian Chronicle*. In addition, the Holy Day of the Savior, which, according to the *Bulgar Narration*, resulted from Andrej's victory over the Bulgars, is mentioned in the Trinity *kondakarion*

of the late twelfth century and the Archangel synaxary of the early thirteenth.[2] Moreover, we know from the Prince's chronicler that Andrej began the construction of a church dedicated to the Savior soon after his victory over the Bulgars. The Prince was fond of constructing churches to celebrate newly proclaimed holidays; the building of the Church of the Intercession (Pokrov-na-Nerli), for example, is closely associated with Andrej's proclamation of the Holy Day of the Intercession, as was the composition of a sacred text in celebration of those events.[3] Also, according to the *Narration of the Miracles,* a holy day was proclaimed upon completion of the Golden Gates of Vladimir.[4] Finally, the *Bulgar Narration* itself reveals attitudes quite plausibly attributable to the bookmen of Prince Andrej's court.

Some historians base their argument for the twelfth century origin of the *Bulgar Narration* on its inclusion in some of the manuscripts of the *Narration of the Miracles.* In the *Book of the Generations* (*Stepennaja kniga*) the *Bulgar Narration* immediately follows upon the *Narration of the Miracles*[5] and is, as it were, the concluding miracle of the cycle. In the seventeenth-century *Miljutin Menology* the *Bulgar Narration* introduces the *Narration of the Miracles.*[6] On the other hand, the *Bulgar Narration* is published separately in a sixteenth-century *Miscellany* of the Zabelin collection.[7] Ključevskij and Voronin contend that all of these editions hark back to a twelfth-century prototype in which the two tales were combined: indeed, it was for this reason that Ključevskij published them together.[8] Voronin further suggests that both *Narrations* may have comprised one larger work, no longer extant, which included other miracles as well.[9]

All discussion regarding the original togetherness of the narrations clearly lies in the realm of speculation. It is equally possible that copyists after the twelfth century combined the two *Narrations* precisely because of their topical similarities and their common references to Prince Andrej. Moreover, as will become evident in the succeeding pages, the *Bulgar Narration* deviates considerably more from its hypothetical twelfth-century original than does the *Narration of the Miracles,* suggesting a separate origin and transmission through the centuries. Finally, and most significantly, a comparison of the style and themes of both works suggests that although conceivably the products of the same ideological school, they are altogether separate endeavors. The language of the *Bulgar Narration* is formal and official; the language of the *Narration of the Miracles* is informal and folkish. Correspondingly, the image of the Prince in the former work is hieratic and militant; in the latter work it is imminent and pacific. Consequently, the argument for the authenticity of the *Bulgar Narration*

based on its original incorporation within the *Miracle Narration* is most improbable and cannot be adduced to the other evidence in support of its composition by the Bogoljubskij school. We must rely, rather, on the aforesaid data — especially, as should become clear in the succeeding pages, on parallels with other works assigned to the period in question. Yet here, too, we remain suspended in the murky realm of conjecture.

Further qualification with regard to authenticity, alas, must be entered before we can proceed to an analysis of the hypothetical Bogoljubskij version of the *Skazanie o pobede nad Bolgarami.* Both Zabelin's sixteenth century MS and Ključevskij's seventeenth century MS are replete with anachronisms which cast an excess of Muscovite political ideology onto the argument of our alleged prototype. The most flagrant of such emendations involve titulature and titulary epithets. For example, Andrej is called *Blagočestivyj i vernyj car' naš knjaz'* and his forebear Vladimir Monomax is called *car' i knjaz' vsej Rusi.*[10] It should be noted that not all historians suspect the authenticity of these titles. Voronin, for example, points to related instances in other sources of the period to defend the twelfth century origin of these words.[11] Jaroslav the Wise, Rybakov claims, was once called *naš car'.*[12] And Jurij Dolgorukij, according to the *Hypatian Chronicle,* commanded the enemy Izjaslav of Kiev, to rule in the following fashion: *a ty sedi car'stvuja v Kieve.*[13] The *Laurentian Chronicle* similarly describes the hand of Prince Andrej as *blagočestivaja car'skaja.*[14] Moreover, the Agapetan axiom, included in the accounts of Andrej's murder, suggests that Andrej's power was like that of a tsar.[15] But there is a vast difference between the epithet tsar-like and the title tsar, and no document assigned to Bogoljubskij's reign awards this title to anyone other than God and the Byzantine Emperor. It is far more likely that the original *Bulgar Narration* ascribed to both Andrej and Monomax the title *knjaz'.*

Another anachronistic distortion of some consequence should be registered. We learn early in the *Bulgar Narration* that Tsar Manuel and Prince Andrej proclaimed the Holy Day of the Savior "by order of the Patriarch Luke and the Metropolitan of all Russia Constantine and the Bishop of Rostov Nestor."[16] The suggestion that the Metropolitan of Kiev, whose power is exalted by the questionable title "of all Russia," supported Andrej's wishes and that the Prince sought his support just as Manuel sought that of Patriarch Luke hardly could have stood in the original text, in view of the Prince's conscientious efforts to disassociate himself from the Church of Kiev whenever possible. Moreover, there was no Metropolitan Constantine in Russia soon after the battle of 1164.[18] Similarly, Bishop Nestor was removed from office as early as 1156[19] and therefore, at least in

an official capacity, could have played no role in the sanctioning of the holiday. It is conceivable nonetheless that the original text juxtaposed the relationship between Patriarch Luke and Emperor Manuel on the one hand and Bishop Nestor and Prince Andrej on the other, but the title "Bishop of Rostov" casts further doubt on this possibility. In a work as pretentious as the *Bulgar Narration* it is very improbable that Andrej's ally within the church would have been entitled "Bishop of Rostov," the official Kievan designation of his office. This title suggests a Rostov reworking of the *Bulgar Narration* of which there is at least one other indication to be discussed presently.

With the necessary caution registered, we can now turn to an analysis of the text. We shall attempt, as we go along, to distinguish between those passages which may belong to an original version and those which may have been rephrased by later scribes. *The Narration on the Defeat of the Bulgars*, according to the Zabelin edition (appendix II), commences thus:

> On the first day of the month of August we celebrate the all-merciful Christ our Lord and his most true Mother. We should all know, beloved brothers, that we celebrate the Day of the Mercy of the Lord Pantokrator established by our most honorable and pious [Tsar and] Prince Andrej together with the Tsar Manuel by order of the Patriarch Luke and the [Metropolitan of all Russia Constantine and the Bishop of Rostov Nestor.] [This was established] when Manuel lived in peace and brotherly love with our most honorable Prince Andrej.

It is likely that most of these introductory remarks faithfully reproduce the original text. We are told of the joint decision of Andrej and Manuel Comnenus to establish "the Day of the Pantokrator" on August first. Most probably one of Andrej's writers made such a claim. Manuel established no such holiday at this time or at any other with Prince Andrej; the Holy Day of the Savior was strictly a Vladimirite inspiration to justify the Prince's infringement on the prerogatives of the official Russian Church. Just as Andrej established the Holy Day of the Intercession for which he contracted the writing of several short pieces, so, probably, he proclaimed this holiday and ordered the creation of a *Narration* to justify it. Like the Holy Day of the Savior, the Holy Day of the Intercession resulted from a miracle shared by the people of Constantinople and Vladimir.[20] Andrej's interest in feigning a Byzantine alliance with respect to the affairs of the church is confirmed in the *Laurentian Chronicle*, where we learn of Manuel's opposition to the religious practices of Leon,[21] Andrej's adversary and the protégé of the Metropolitan of Kiev. The *Chronicle* implies that Manuel and Andrej shared a common enemy and a vital interest in promoting the lenient view

on the holiday fast controversy. Although this implied suggestion is as unfounded as the information concerning the establishment of a shared holiday, both reveal Andrej's interest in proclaiming a holy alliance (*bratoljubie*) with a near equal, the highest Christian ruler on earth — particularly when he wanted to take ecclesiastical matters into his own hands and establish a new metropolitan see at Vladimir.

Next the *Bulgar Narration* describes the procession of Andrej and his troops to the crusade:[22]

> Now it came to pass that on the very same day they [Andrej and Manuel] went to battle, one from Tsargrad upon the Saracens, the other from Rostov upon the Bulgars. Andrej had a custom when he went to battle: two priests dressed in liturgical garments came along with a pure spirit and carried the icon of Mary Our Lady the Most Wonderful Mother of God and a Cross. Before the battle the priests received from the sacred mysteries the body and blood of the Lord. They were with him (Andrej) when he said "O Virgin and Mother of God who bore Christ our Lord, whoever trusts in You shall not perish [cf. Ps. 125: 1]. I, your servant, have You as my wall and protection (*imeju tja stenu i pokrov'*) and the Cross of Your Son, both sharp weapons in battle and a fire singeing the faces of our adversaries who wish to fight against us" [Is. 26: 11].

Manuel, of course, embarked on no such campaign on that day, but his prestige as a crusader must have triggered the author's imagination.[23] Like the Byzantine emperor, Andrej is said to follow the custom of bringing his icon to battle. His prayer to the icon is very similar to his prayers in the *Narration of the Miracles.* And his posture as suppliant for his people is repeated in the *Pokrov* writings and in the *Life of Leontius, Bishop of Rostov.*[24] One word in the above passage, however, seems suspicious. The parallel between Constantinople and Rostov, as opposed to Vladimir, makes little sense, for it was Vladimir which came to be Bogoljubskij's counterpart to the capital of the Byzantine Empire. The substitution of Rostov for Vladimir was probably another emendation of a Rostovian bookman.[25]

In the above passage Prince Andrej comes to battle like a crusading soldier. He arranges that his precious icon accompany the procession. He arranges for further ceremony as well: accompanying priests say a mass before the cross and the icon. They celebrate the sacred mysteries. The body and blood of the Lord become transubstantiated, as it were, before their very eyes. Finally, Andrej prays to the Virgin, as we have seen him do before, but this time it is to mother and child. Christ comes to share the

limelight with the Holy Mother of God of Vladimir. The Prince reaches out to icon and cross to celebrate the sources of his military might.

Next the *Narration* describes the battle itself and the vision which occurs in its midst:[26]

> And then they captured four Bulgar towns and a fifth — Brjaximov on the Kama River. And when Andrej returned from battle they all saw a vision: fiery rays were emanating from the icon of our Lord the Savior, and his entire host nearby saw this. Andrej returned to battle and attacked the towns with fire and lay waste to their land. And he besieged other towns and exacted revenues from them. And Manuel also beheld the same vision there on the first day of August.

The *Laurentian Chronicle*'s description of the battle corresponds closely to the above passage:[27]

> In that year (1164) Prince Andrej attacked the Bulgars with his son Izjaslav and his brother Jaroslav and with Prince Jurij of Murom. And the Lord and the holy Virgin assisted them against the Bulgars. They destroyed a multitude of Bulgars and took their banners. And with great difficulty the Prince of the Bulgars fled with a small retinue to their Great City. And Prince Andrej returned victoriously when he saw the pagan Bulgars slain and all his retinue intact. The footsoldiers stood with the icon of the Holy Virgin on the field beneath the banners. And approaching the icon (and the footsoldiers) Prince Andrej and Jurij, Izjaslav and Jaroslav and the entire retinue threw themselves before the Holy Virgin and began to kiss Her image with great joy and with tears. They offered Her praises and songs and then took Brjaximov, their glorious city. But first they burned three other towns. And this was a new miracle of the icon of the Vladimir Virgin which the pious Prince Andrej had taken with him to battle. He carried it in glory back to the golden-domed Church of the Virgin of Vladimir where it stands to this very day.

The above accounts of the battle resemble one another, yet differ substantially. According to both, the battle occurs in two stages, in each case interrupted by a period of meditation and prayer. The atmosphere of a holy war prevails in both. The troops give thanks to the Virgin: in the *Narration*, "and they all fell upon their knees before the Holy Mother of God kissing Her [icon] with tears" (*i padoša vsi na kolenu pred svjatuju Bogorodiceju so slezami celujušče*); in the chronicle account, "and they bowed down before the Holy Mother of God and began to kiss the Holy Mother of God with great joy and with tears" (*udariša celom pered svjatoju Bogorodiceju i počaša celovati svjatou Bogorodicju s radost'ju velikoju i so slezami*). The

parallels between the two passages suggest either a common source, that one work derives from the other, or, simply, that they share the clichés of prayer language. In many respects the *Bulgar Narration* stands in sharp contrast to the chronicle account of the 1164 victory. The chronicle account focuses on the battle itself and on the military successes of Andrej and his troops. The icon intercedes in their behalf as it does in other chronicle accounts of battles fought during the reign of the Prince. The *Bulgar Narration* centers around a vision: "fiery rays were emanating from the icon of our Lord the Savior." This vision fulfills Andrej's earlier prayer to the icon, when the Prince describes mother and son as "a fire singeing the faces of our adversaries." The vision propels the troops to defeat the Bulgars. It is a militant vision: Christ comes down from the sky in a flame and inspires the Prince's victory. Andrej becomes defender of the faith — and not alone, for we learn, too, that the identical vision was beheld by Tsar Manuel himself. Both are the beneficiaries of a militant Christ.

The vision itself as described in the *Bulgar Narration* resembles several other works of Andrej's school. Just as fiery rays emanate from the icon of Christ, so a supernatural glow is emitted by the Virgin's vestment (*pokrov*) in the *Prayer* and *Prolog Narration* on that subject[28] and from the miraculously well-preserved remains of Leontius of Rostov according to the *Life* of this saint.[29] The assertion that Manuel saw the same vision there (*tamo*) is reminiscent of the *Pokrov* writings in which the Virgin is beseeched to reveal herself in a vision identical to the one held there (*tamo*), i.e. in the Church of the Blachernae in Constantinople.[30] The suggestion of shared supernatural experience underscores not so much Prince Andrej's desire to compete with Byzantine hegemony, as modern Bogoljubskij mythologists would have it,[31] as his desire to participate, like his Kievan predecessors, in the special divine protection which that great Empire enjoyed. This divine protection was a powerful ideological weapon for a Prince aspiring to make an autonomous ecclesiastical decision — the establishment of a feast day.

A prayer to the Savior follows the description of the vision and the battle in the *Bulgar Narration*:[32]

> Just as the prophet said "I will be merciful to the one I wish" [Ex. 33:19; Rom. 9:15], so now, O Lord, protect all the people of the Russian land who are relying on Thee. For this reason all fall before Thee saying "O Lord Jesus Christ, how shall we repay Thee for all that Thou hast given unto us?" [Ps. 116:12] . . . Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who keeps us from imprisonment by the enemy. Look upon us and with glory raise the right hand of those relying on Thee . . . With Thy glory, O Lord, fill the

churches in which like a door Thou hast shown heaven on earth . . . Look down from on high in heaven and behold and visit Thy vineyard; perfect what Thy right hand has planted. The eyes of all, O Lord, rely upon Thy mercy and generosity . . . And Thou on the throne of heaven look below upon the earth with Thy merciful eyes [cf. Ps. 11:4] upon all the people relying on Thee and on Thy most holy Mother and on all Thy saints who suffered for Thy name in behalf of us sinners who bring this prayer to Thee.

The above prayer, replete with allusions to Psalms, derives in part from Vladimir Svjatoslavič's prayer to the Lord upon completion of his Church of the Virgin in Kiev (The Tithe Church), in which Vladimir beseeches the Lord: *Gospodi Bože, prizri s nebese i viž' i posadi vinograda svoego i s'verši jaže nasadi desnica tvoja.*[33] This prayer has strong thematic similarities to the *Pokrov* Prayer and consequently appears to be a genuine twelfth-century creation of Prince Andrej's bookmen. For example, the phrase *Gospod' Bog' iže nedast' nas vo plen' vragom . . . prizri na ny milost'ju svojeju* is reminiscent of *ot plena spasati i vsjakoja napasti* and *ot pečali i napasti izbavljaeši milostiju svojeju.*[34] And in the above prayer the expression *vsja ljudi upovajuščaa na tja* is similar to the *Pokrov Prayer*'s *na tja bo upovaem*[35] and *esi vsem' upovajuščim' spasenie i pomoščnica.*[36] Assuming its authenticity, this psalm-laden prayer is an homage to Christ and a plea for continued protection against the infidel.

After the prayer our two best manuscripts of the *Narration* diverge. Both texts speak of Prince Andrej in the first person, suggesting either that he wrote the *Narration* or that at least he was the narrator. The Zabelin manuscript states the following:[37]

I wrote this according to the wishes of the Tsar Manuel and the permission of all the clergy . . . Thus this holiday was established by the lowly and sinful servant of God, Prince Andrej, son of Jurij, grandson of Monomax, called Vladimir, tsar and prince of all Rus' . . . To me, a sinner and your lowly servant, Andrej, add your ineffable mercies. . . .

According to the Ključevskij manuscript Andrej describes himself in comparable terms, but without the lofty Muscovite titulature:[38]

And to me, O Lord, a sinner, give repentance before I die. I have sinned more than Sodom and Gemorrah. I have angered your love of humanity and have repulsed my guardian angel.

The *Jaroslavskij spisok* of the *Narration*, moreover, explicitly states that Andrej was its author.[39] Voronin ascribes the authorship of the *Narration*

to the Prince,[40] but it is equally possible that the *Narration* simply casts Andrej as its narrator, a feature prevalent in the *pokrov* writings and the *Life of Leontius* as well.

Andrej's designation as *xudyj i grešnyj rab* recalls Monomax's Testament in which the Grand Prince alludes to himself as *xudyj, ot xudogo moego bezumija* and *mja grešnago i xudogo*.[41] The self-abasement motif is also characteristic of the *Služba na Pokrov* in which the narrator (conceivably Andrej) says *mnogimi otjagotix'sja grexy i nedoumeju po dostojaniju napisati tvoego Bogorodice pokrova poxvaly*.[42] Andrej, or rather the author of the *Bulgar Narration* followed the *topos* of self-effacement after the fashion of a monkish writer.

Although the Ključevskij manuscript is more modest, the Zabelin text includes a few sentences which seem appropriate to the *Narration* as a whole. Andrej asserts his direct role in establishing a holiday in honor of Christ. He also asserts his proximate relations with Manuel and all the clergy.

The *Narration of the Defeat of the Bulgars* is a powerful statement about the militant aspect of the image of Prince Andrej. It is an homage to the true Tsars of Christendom — heavenly and earthly — and to the Prince who perceived himself as a not very distorted likeness. Together with the Emperor of Constantinople, he attacks pagans, has visions, and declares religious holidays to commemorate his crusade. Like Christ himself, Prince Andrej singes the faces of the foe.

VI

Intercession: The *Pokrov* Cult

Prince Andrej intensified the cult of the Virgin through the proclamation of another holy day: the *Prazdnik Pokrova*, or Holy Day of the Intercession. This holy day became an annual testimony to the sacredness of the new promised land and of the Prince who chose to rule it.

The Holy Day of the Intercession, October first, is a curious date on Prince Andrej's sacred calendar.[1] Whereas other holy days — most notably the *Prazdnik Spasa* — honored the miraculous intervention of the deity within the Rostov Land, this holy day commemorated a miracle which took place in the Church of the Blachernae Palace in Constantinople. The divine presence did not yield a joint vision, as in the case of the fiery rays before Prince and Tsar, but a single vision before a single person called, interestingly enough, Andrej. This Andrej was not a Russian, however, but a Greek. And he was not a prince, but a holy fool (*salos, jurodivyj*).

Prince Andrej's resolve to declare the *Prazdnik Pokrova* prompted the composition of two literary works — a *Prologue Narration* (*Proložnoe skazanie*) and a Service Hymn (*Služba*).[2] The holiday itself, the above narratives, and, of course, Andrej's church of the Pokrov on the Nerl River (*Pokrov-na-Nerli*) suggest the beginning of a new kind of Virgin cult — one not associated with an icon, but with a protective, intercessory garment, or *pokrov*, to be spread upon her chosen benefactors.

Russian and Soviet historiography on the *Pokrov* cult has resulted in some misreading of the holiday's significance. The Byzantine background of the holiday was at first exaggerated, later ignored, and, finally, distorted. Until 1898, most historians of the Russian church assumed that the Russian practice of the holiday was a continuation of a Byzantine observance. They were misled by a spurious assertion to this effect by the Grecophile Paxomij the Serb, whose fifteenth-century *Slovo na Pokrov*, an embellishment of the *Pokrov* writings attributable to Andrej's time, stated that the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople "established the divine, miraculous Holy Day of the Intercession of the Holy One on the first day of October."[3]

However, Sergij, Archbishop of Vladimir, observed in 1898 that no Greek synaxary, menology or book of prayers mentions the holiday, that Russian menologies specifically refer to the holiday as "new," and that the *Pokrov* writings themselves, Paxomij's *Slovo* excepted, affirm the Russian origin of the holiday.[4] Since Sergij's investigation of the problem, the Holy Day of the Intercession has been assumed to be a Russian creation.

An unfortunate result of Sergij's otherwise meritorious research has been the disregard of the Byzantine roots of the *Pokrov* motif. After 1898 historians stressed the originality of the holiday and focused their research on the time and place of its Russian origin. Sergij had opted for twelfth-century Kiev, basing his hypothesis on the following evidence: (1) first mention of the holiday in the oldest Slavic Prologue, dating probably to the middle of the twelfth century; (2) inclusion of the oldest manuscript of the *Služba na Pokrov* in the fourteenth-century *Pergamen Psalter* together with references to Kievan holidays; and (3) the grand princely tone of the *Pokrov* writings. He also suggested that Andrej Bogoljubskij might have been responsible for establishing the holiday while he was still on friendly terms with his father — i.e. before 1155.[5]

In 1911 M. A. Ostroumov countered Sergij's hypothesis with what has come to be the accepted theory on the origin of the holiday. Ostroumov argued that it was Prince Andrej who founded the Holy Day of the Intercession and that he did so after he became Prince of Rostov-Suzdal' in 1157. He based his theory on (1) the fact that the first church in *Rus'* dedicated to the Intercession was Andrej's *Pokrov na Nerli*; (2) the identification of the "pagans" discussed in the *Služba* with the Volga Bulgars; (3) Prince Andrej's habit of establishing holidays; (4) thematic similarities with other Bogoljubskij writings; (5) the association of the *Služba*'s plea to "increase the population" with the new city of Vladimir; (6) the inclusion of the earliest text of the *Proložnoe skazanie* in a northern collection — the *Sofijskij prolog* of Novgorod, dating to the thirteenth century; (7) a commemoration of Prince Andrej in some saints' lives on October the second, the day after the holiday and the day on which Andrej the God's Fool, from whose *Life* much of the *Pokrov* motifs are borrowed, is remembered; and (8) the exclusively northern traces of the *Pokrov* cult.[6]

Sergij's and Ostroumov's research lay the foundation for twentieth-century exploration of the *Pokrov* cult in Russia. Their preoccupation with the Russian origin of the holiday, resulting in an unwillingness even to consider its Byzantine background, has been replaced by a tendency to accept the background and then to interpret its significance in a manner which in my view is not supported by historical context. Soviet historians

credit Andrej Bogoljubskij with a competitive instinct vis-à-vis Byzantium and with resentment of Greek hegemony over his Church. Consequently they regard the Byzantine origins of the *Pokrov* motif as a sign of Andrej's defiant attitude toward the Empire.[7] It is far more probable, assuming that Andrej established the holiday and sponsored the *Pokrov* writings, that he borrowed from Byzantium because Kiev had borrowed from Byzantium. Association, however remote, with one of the most powerful Christian empires of his day would have had major value in his quest for ecclesiastical autonomy and political supremacy in *Rus'*.

There were ample precedents in Kiev for adopting the cultural values and literary motifs of Byzantium; lessons could be drawn from the use to which writers put their knowledge of Byzantine piety. Hilarion of Kiev, for example, praised Greek piety in his *Sermon on Law and Grace* and then enhanced his portrait of Vladimir Svjatoslavič by a lavish comparison with the Emperor Constantine.[8] Hilarion also borrowed the Byzantine theme of the Virgin-protected capital city to enhance the prestige of Kiev. Again in the *Sermon* he alluded to Kiev as "the city of the most glorious Holy Mother of God, a speedy helper of Christians" (*grad svjatej vseslavnej skorej na pomošč' xristjanom svjatej Bogorodici*).[9] The image of the Virgin as speedy helper was borrowed, possibly from Hilarion, by the author of the *Pokrov* writings. Vladimir Monomax also made use of the same motif in a prayer cited in the *Laurentian Chronicle* which he uttered to the Virgin:[10]

> Pure Virgin Mother, preserve Thy city, which through Thy help endures in faith, that we may be strengthened by Thee and hope in Thee, and conquer all obstacles, overthrowing our enemies and living in obedience.

This prayer is very similar to the chants of the *Služba* and may have influenced them.

Together with ample Kievan precedent for the mimesis of Byzantine culture, particularly concerning the theme of the Virgin-protected city, the author of the *Pokrov* writings could turn to a rich Greek background on the Virgin's intercession in behalf of Constantinople — on one occasion, against the Russians. A number of Byzantine sources report the transportation from Jerusalem to Constantinople of a vestment (ἡ ἐσθής) of the Virgin which revealed her intercessory powers. The vestment was placed in the Church of the Blachernae in 469.[11] One of the early instances of the vestment's effectiveness is disclosed in a sermon composed by Constantinopolitan Patriarch Photius during the first Russian attack on Constantinople in 860. Photius attributes the successful defense against the Russian

invaders to the miraculous protection of the sacred vestment (τὴν περιβολήν):[12]

> When we were beseeching God with litanies and chants, when in contrition of our hearts we were repenting . . . then we saw the disappearance of the threat, and the wrath of God seemed to recede from us; for then we saw our enemies withdrawing, and the city, which had been menaced with pillaging, free of devastation. Since we were deprived of any help and were in great want of power of men, we rested our expectations upon the Mother of Our Lord and God, and were comforted; we implored Her to appeal to Her Son for the atonement of our transgressions; we called upon Her intercession for our rescue, upon Her protection to watch upon the impregnable wall. We implored Her to break down the audacious rashness of the barbarians, to pull down their insolence, to defend the people in despair, to fight for Her own flock. The entire city bore with me Her garment for the repulse of the besiegers and the protection of the besieged; we offered prayers and made a litany. And through the marvelous benevolence of the free petition of the Mother, God has inclined toward us, wrath has been averted, and the Lord has shown mercy upon his flock. This venerable garment is, indeed, the dress of the Mother of God. It went around the walls, and the enemy inexplicably turned their backs (and fled). It protected the city and the stronghold of the enemies collapsed as if by a sign. It [the garment] covered the city, and the enemy were deprived of their hope upon which they depended. As soon as the Virgin's garment had been borne around the wall, the barbarians raised the siege and withdrew. . . .

The protective powers of the Virgin's vestment is repeated in other Byzantine accounts of the Russian attack. Various versions of Symeon Logothete claim that the procession involved not only Photius but the Emperor (Michael III) as well.[13] Hamartolus describes the carrying of the relic around the walls of Constantinople, after which it was dipped into the Sea of Marmora, producing a storm strong enough to destroy most of the Russian ships.[14]

The *Russian Primary Chronicle* echoes Hamartolus' account of the first Russian attack on Constantinople:[15]

> Askold and Dir attacked the Greeks during the fourteenth year of the reign of Emperor Michael. When the Emperor set forth against the infidels and had arrived at the Black River, the eparch sent him word that the Russes were approaching Tsar'grad, and the Emperor turned back. Upon arriving inside the strait, the Russes made a great massacre of the Christians, and attacked Tsar'grad in two hundred boats. The Emperor succeeded with difficulty in entering the city. He straightway hastened

> with the Patriarch Photius to the Church of the Lady of the Blachernae, where they prayed all night. They also sang hymns and carried the sacred vestment (*riza*) of the Virgin to dip it into the sea. The weather was still, the sea was calm, but a storm of wind came up, and when great waves straightway rose, confusing the boats of the godless Russes, it threw them upon the shore and broke them up, so that few escaped such destruction and returned to their native land.

The Byzantine source most relevant to the Vladimirite *Pokrov* writings is the tenth-century *Life of Andrew (Andrej) the God's Fool* (Andrej Jurodivyj).[16] Toward the conclusion of this work the Virgin appears with her sacred garment (τὸ μαφόριον, *omofor'*) before Andrej and his teacher Epiphaniij:[17]

> During the all-night service in the Holy Church of the Blachernae, where the blessed Andrej usually performed his good works, only Epiphaniij and his pupil spent the duration of the service in the Church, while some were there until midnight and others until daylight. At four o'clock in the morning the blessed Andrej saw the Holy Virgin Herself high in the air entering the imperial gates with Her formidable retinue, among them John the Baptist and St. John on each side of Her; many other holy ones in white *rizy* came before Her, while others followed Her, chanting spiritual songs. And when the holy one (Andrej) approached the pulpit, he came up to Epiphaniij and said: "Do you see the Lady and Empress of all the world?" And he said, "I see, my father." When they had witnessed these things, they bowed down on their knees. She began to pray for many hours with tears covering her divine face. And after the prayers She came to the altar to pray for those standing there. And then She grew silent; She removed Her garment which lay on Her miraculous head. It had the appearance of lightning. She took it off with Her hands and it was awesome and great. She covered it over all the people standing there and for many hours She watched from above the people covered by the garment which was like a light in glory to God. The holy Virgin remained there a long while. Then She left and did not appear again. She took the garment with Her, but left Her grace upon those who were there.

Inspired by the experience of Prince Andrej's namesake, the author of the *Pokrov* writings borrowed directly from the experience in the Church of the Blachernae described in the above quotation from the *Life of Andrej the God's Fool*. Intrigued and inspired by the protection accorded the imperial city through the Virgin's intercession with Christ, Bogoljubskij's ideologist created the Vladimirite counterpart to the Byzantine motif of the Virgin protectress.

a. The *Prologue Narration*

The *Prologue Narration* is a short account of the establishment of the *Prazdnik Pokrova*. Narrated in the first person it begins with a description of the Virgin's appearance before Andrej and Epiphaniij:[18]

> Awesome and miraculous was the vision of the reverent holy ones Andrej and Epiphaniij. They saw in the air the Holy Virgin, Who came to the Church of the Blachernae with angels, with John the Baptist, with St. John and with many other holy ones. People were standing in the Church and they saw Her [with tears in Her eyes] praying to Her Son in behalf of all the world. Andrej said to Epiphaniij "Do you see the Lady and Empress of all praying for peace?" And he said "I see, father." She covered the people in the Church with Her sacred vestment (*om'forom'*) which glowed more than amber.

Inspired by the Virgin's intercession with Christ in behalf of the congregation of the Blachernae, the narrator asks himself, "How can this awesome . . . vision . . . be without a holiday [in its honor]?"[19] and beseeches the Virgin to protect his people:[20]

> As You protected the people in the church there, so, now, protect us, Your sinful servants . . . Nullify the advice and schemes of those with evil intentions and save us according to the mercy of Your Son now and forever. For we come to You in awe and faith and rely upon You, our speedy protector and helper.

Probably the narrator of the *Prologue Narration* is Prince Andrej. Just as he declared a holiday in honor of his defeat of the Bulgars according to the *Narration of the Defeat of the Bulgars,* so, probably, in this tale he makes a similar declaration. Voronin thinks that Andrej wrote the *Prologue Narration* as well.[21] Although this is conceivable, it is far more likely that one of the churchmen of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma performed the task.

As narrator, assuming this to have been the case, Andrej honors Constantinople and the Virgin's protection of his own Byzantine-like city. Although the Virgin's vestment was not actually transferred, as was the icon of the Virgin, the *Prologue Narration* suggests that its powers were transferred, or at least shared. The idea of the translation of the special benevolence bestowed upon Byzantium by the Virgin foreshadows later Muscovite translation-of-the-empire themes such as the myths of the Third Rome and Monomax's hat. But Andrej Bogoljubskij was not a tsar: the preroga-

tives of that office were still reserved for the Emperor and for Christ. The Byzantine Empire was still an important entity in Andrej's time, and his need to borrow Byzantine objects was more a result of recognition of his power and a need for its support than an attempt to challenge it.

b. The *Service Hymn*

The *Service Hymn* (*Služba na Pokrov*) develops the themes of the *Prologue Narration* and is probably an embellishment of that work.[22] The *Service Hymn* appears to be a chain of verses in praise of the Virgin with no apparent inter-topical relationship. In fact, it is a highly structured work composed according to the canons of Byzantine hymnography. It is divided into five songs, each of which contains seven to ten separate verses. Each of the five songs is devoted to a special theme. The *Hymn* never names Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma or Andrej, but the anonymous city and prince should be so identified, if one accepts, as I do, the dating of Ostroumov and Voronin.

The first song more or less parallels the *Prologue Narration*, but introduces the larger themes to be developed in the succeeding songs. It begins with an invocation to the Virgin:[23]

> O great intercessor for the despondent, You are, Virgin, a marvelous and speedy helper, our salvation and our assurance, the divine depth of mercy, the source of wisdom and the protectress of the world. Let us sing in praise of Her sacred, shining vestment. . . .

The words "intercessor for the despondent . . . speedy helper" (*zastuplenie pečal'nym . . . skoraja pomošč'*) recall the passage in the *Prologue Narration* which defines the Virgin as "our intercessor and speedy helper" (*skoraja naše zastuplenie i pomošč'*).[24] The similarity of the *Hymn* to the *Prologue Narration* could suggest their common authorship.

The second stanza of the first song alludes to the prophet Isaiah's description of the new Jerusalem. It quotes Isaiah 2, 2: "It shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains."[25] Just as Jerusalem set its house of God high on a hill, the *Hymn* states, "we have observed the abundance of mountains and hills embellished with the manifold churches." Assuming, in spite of Vladimir's flat terrain, that the "we" refers to the people of Vladimir, this city with its "hills and mountains" in some sense is said to fulfill the prophesy of a new Jerusalem.[26] The stanza echoes a passage in the *Narration of the Murder of Prince Andrej* in which a parallel is

drawn between the temple of Solomon and several Bogoljubskij churches.[27]

The third stanza alludes to the prophets, angels and martyrs whose experiences anticipated the intercession of the Virgin[28] and introduces one of the major themes of the *Hymn* — Biblical precedent for the *Pokrov* miracle and for the activities of the city under the Virgin's protection.

The fourth stanza refers for the first time to the holiday.[29] It compares Christ's Incarnation to the appearance of dew on the earth,[30] a topos of Kievan literature.[31] The next stanza speaks of the Virgin's intercession on behalf of the town and its people (*grad i ljudi*) as a result of their establishment of the *Prazdnik Pokrova*.[32] The *Hymn*'s constant connection of the town and its inhabitants is not just rhetorical, but stemmed from Andrej's close association with the townspeople of Vladimir.[33] Indeed, the entire *Hymn* might be said to affirm the sacred loyalty of the *ljudi* to their *grad*.

In the sixth stanza the Virgin's vestment is compared to the ram of Aaron. According to Exodus 26: 14, God commanded Moses to construct a tabernacle with "a covering of tanned rams' skins and goatskins." As the rams' skins covered the tabernacle, the *Hymn* suggests, so the *Pokrov* covers the church. But the Virgin's vestment outshines the rams' skins and goatskins: "it glowed more than the rays of the sun."[34] The image of the shining vestment probably comes from the *Life of Andrew The God's Fool*, where the *omofor'* is compared to a lamp and to amber. The comparison to amber is echoed in the *Prologue Narration*.

The seventh and final stanza of the first song introduces the implications of the *Pokrov* motif for humanity at large — the efficacy of the Virgin's intercession for all the world.[35] Voronin is particularly struck by his theme. He contrasts the "universal" quality of Andrej's *Pokrov* cult with its "local" character in Byzantium, where the cult was confined to the congregation of the Church of the Blachernae, and consequently honors his forebears for their magnanimity.[36] In this instance, Voronin seems to go too far! Byzantium clearly had ecumenical pretensions, as would a Prince zealous to avoid Kiev and to establish direct ties with Byzantium. Moreover, in miracle tales of this sort, sacred space and time are magical and generally without rational boundaries.

The *Hymn*'s second song stresses the political implications of the Holy Day of the Intercession. The Virgin is beseeched to give "peace to the world and power to princes."[37] She is asked to "save us from all evil."[38] Her vestment is compared to the veil of the Ark of the Covenant (*skiniju tamo*; cf. Exodus 40: 19),[39] which, like the *pokrov*, was endowed with supernatural powers as an instrument of salvation. The Old Testament prefiguration theme is reinforced in a later stanza with a reference to King David:[40]

As in the days of old before the calf David gathered choirs and played, so now running to You, beseeching You to pray for us who honor You, we celebrate and glorify Your *pokrov*.

According to Second Samuel 6:5, "David and all the house of Israel were making merry before the Lord with songs and lyres and harps and tambourines and castanets and cymbals." This passage depicts David prior to his battle with the pagan Philistines playing his lyre in front of the Ark of the Lord in Jerusalem in recognition of God's protection. The *Hymn* suggests here that like David's choir in Jerusalem, the people of Vladimir glorify the Lord Who has chosen them for special protection. The fifth stanza echoes the chosen people theme with a reference to the vision of Andrej the God's Fool.[41] Stanza six asks the Virgin to "defend the Prince and the people from all evil."[42] Here the standard coupling of town and people (*grad i ljudi*) shifts to prince and people (*knjaz' i ljudi*), as if prince and city were inextricably intertwined. The eighth stanza alludes to God's appearance in a dewy fleece before Gideon who then delivered the Israelites from the persecution of the pagan Midianites (cf. Judges 6:37) and asks the Virgin to intercede with Christ "to give victory to the prince over his enemies."[43] As Gideon was the divinely chosen defender of the Jews, so, now, the prince defends his *grad i ljudi* from their foe.

The third song concerns the prince at war. The prince is compared to King David: "Strengthen, O Virgin, the prince who glorifies You against his enemies as [God did] David against Goliath."[44] The Virgin is said to be the "protectress of our tribe" (*zastupnica rodou našemu*).[45] She is asked to be "our defense" (*ograženie naše*),[46] and "to give victory to our prince and to slay those warring against us."[47]

The fourth song takes as its subject the salvation of humanity and lacks the political and, in all likelihood, local overtones of the other songs. The Virgin is asked "to turn our sadness into joy."[48] It is said that tsars and princes throughout the world bring gifts to the Virgin and rejoice in her ability to intercede for them.[49] One stanza entreats the Virgin to destroy "all demonic deceit" and to "fill the world with faith"; it recalls the "great grief" of Daniel[50] who suffered in the lion's den but was ultimately saved because of his unfailing loyalty to God. Piety is exalted throughout the song as is the Virgin's mercy.[51]

The fifth and final song concerns the all-Russian implications of the holiday. The Virgin is beseeched to "pray to God for us sinners who celebrate the feast of thine intercession in the Russian land."[52] A contrast is drawn between the good and the bad prince, and the Virgin is asked to

"diminish the pride and arrogance and nullify the counsel of the unjust princes" and "to raise the horn of our most honorable prince."[53] Another stanza asks for "soundness of body for our prince and victory over the pagans." It asks, too, for the salvation of the city and for the aggrandizement of its population.[54]

Thus ends the *Service Hymn* to the Virgin, a lengthy prayer beseeching the Mother of God to intercede with Christ for the protection of Vladimir. This prayer, as well as all signs of a *Pokrov* cult in Bogoljubskij's day, affirmed the immanence of God in a new promised land, tied by divine decree to Heaven itself and to the most Orthodox city on earth.

VII

Apostolicity

The final ideological tract to be discussed concerns Rostov — the oldest and most prominent city in Andrej's principality and Vladimir's most serious rival. Rostov could not be quelled; its aristocrats were too wealthy and its ecclesiastics too well connected to permit wholesale destruction. The town had to be placated and, indeed, its traditions had to be exploited.

The special relationship between Vladimir and Rostov is the central theme of *The Life of Leontiij of Rostov*. In this intriguing hagiography associated with the reign of Prince Andrej a new sign of mediation between the divine and the human comes to the fore — a saintly man called Leontiij.

It will come as no surprise to our reader that the text of this tract poses the customary housecleaning problems. Before we tend to them, as well as to the substance of the tract, let us turn first to a translation of our earliest (thirteenth century) extant version.[1] The Russian original of my translation can be found in Appendix V.

> May Twenty-Third: The Day of the Discovery of the Miraculous Body of the Blessed Saint Leontius, Bishop of Rostov, the Miracle Worker.
>
> This blessed one was born and raised in Constantinople. For his many good virtues he was appointed Bishop of the city of Rostov. The previous Bishops, Fedor and Hilarion, had fled [from there] on account of the unbelief and the offensiveness of the people. But this blessed one, fortified by the strength of the Cross, the help of the Holy Mother of God, and his own constant abstention and vigilance, taught them to believe in Christ. He performed many miracles, and of one such miracle we shall speak in brief. The holy one applied himself diligently to teaching and instructing the people in church. He cajoled the young children and persuaded them to refrain from the false teachings of idolatry and to believe in the Holy Trinity — the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. This he did because the older ones, blinded by their unbelief, did not heed his teachings. For Christ spoke the truth when he said "If new wines are poured into new wine-skins, both are saved; but if new wines are poured into old wine-skins, the skins burst and both are ruined" (Matt. 9:17; Mark 2:22; Luke 5:37). Thus the blessed one avoided the older people and instructed the

young. The faithless ones soon went after his annointed head, some with arms and others with sticks, in order to drive him out of town and to kill him. The Bishop was not distressed at all, but rather he gave courage to the deacons and presbyters with him, saying "Children, do not fear their attack; they cannot do anything to us without the will of God." Right away he put on his holy garments and he ordered the deacons and presbyters, too, to put on their holy garments. And they (the unbelievers) came and saw his angelic face. And immediately some fell dead in front of him and others were blinded. But the holy one raised them up again with prayer and cured them and made them well. He taught them to believe in Christ and he baptized them in the name of the Holy Trinity — the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. And after he performed many other miracles worthy of memory in the name of God, Whom he loved from his youth, he departed to Him in peace. His holy and venerable body was placed in the Church of the Most Righteous Mother of God which had been built earlier by his predecessor on the episcopal throne.

After the passing of many years, by divine will the city of Rostov burned — almost the entire city, including the Church of the Holy Virgin. And the God-protected and pious Prince Andrej, the son of Grand Prince Jurij, the grandson of Vladimir, ordered a stone church to be built in the name of the Most Immaculate Virgin on the spot where the church had burned. They began to dig [foundation] trenches. They found some dead bodies there, including that of the blessed Isaiah. When they prepared the foundation only for a small church, the people began to beg Prince Andrej to decree that a larger church be built. And he was persuaded with [some] difficulty and ordered their wish to be fulfilled in accordance with the word of the Lord, Who said in the Gospels: "A city on a high mountain cannot be hidden. And as no one having lit a lamp places it under a plate or a bed" [Matt. 5: 14–15], so this spiritual light cannot remain covered for so many years under the soil. This happened by the providence of the All-Knowing Lord. And they dug a ditch at the south wall of the Church and they found a coffin which was covered with two planks. The people were puzzled; they opened the coffin and saw his face shining like a light, and his garments were as if they had been placed upon him the day before. O brothers, what a great miracle that after so many years had passed his holy body had not deteriorated. And even his garments were not harmed! What is more, neither was the coffin with the body of the saint. When they saw this, the people rejoiced with great joy and related the news to Prince Andrej. They told him of the most glorious miracle which had taken place. When he heard this, the Prince honored the great wisdom of the Lord and prayed to Him, saying: "O Lord Jesus Christ, how shall I repay You for all You have given me (Ps. 116: 12) since in this land, in the territory under my rule You caused this treasure to be revealed?" He remembered and spoke the words of salvation, "'What You kept from the clever and the wise You revealed to the young'" [Matt. 11:25]. And soon he sent a stone coffin and they placed in it the body of the saint. Still now it lies there in the Church of the Holy Mother of God, working glorious

> miracles and cures for those who come in faith to the Most Immaculate Lady, the Holy Mother of God, and to the coffin of the great saint Leontius. [And all this is done] to the glory of Christ our Lord and to the power and victory of the Christ-loving Prince. For it was by the will of our most honorable Prince Andrej that the stone church in Rostov was constructed where the church had burned before. He [Andrej] came to Rostov to his men and he knelt before the blessed and holy body of Leontius, saying: "I praise and glorify You, my Lord, and Your Most Immaculate Mother, that You allowed me to see this treasure in my kingdom. Now I lack nothing because of the gift of Your mercy and divine grace."[19] On account of this saint he kissed the holy remains, as did all his men. They placed the remains in the coffin on the wall where it now lies. And he put up great candles around the coffin.

Our text concludes with a recitation of a number of additional miracles associated with the reign of Prince Andrej's successor Vsevolod and is assumed to be an addition to the hypothetical original *Life*.

We cannot establish a precise dating of the original version of the *Life*, of course. Probably it was composed during Prince Andrej's reign. The reference to Andrej as "our Prince" certainly suggests that he was alive at the time of its composition. Moreover, as Voronin has shown, the author's detailed descriptions of Leontius' coffin and its placement in the rebuilt Church of the Virgin in Rostov imply his witnessing of these ceremonies. Archeological research, moreover, has substantiated the accuracy of the author's references to the location of the stone coffin in the south wall of the Church and to the lamps which were placed about the coffin.[2]

A further clue to the dating is the fact that the reconstructed Church of the Virgin in Rostov, mentioned in the *Life*, necessarily antedates its composition. Unfortunately, the precise date of the completion of this Church cannot be ascertained. One of the later versions of the *Life* claims 1170 as the completion date. Ključevskij accepts 1170 as a *terminus post quem* for the original *Life*.[3] Voronin, on the other hand, argues for an earlier date. Recalling the *Laurentian* chronicler's entry on the Rostov fire s.a. 1160, and a reference to the consecration of the rebuilt Church in the *Tver Chronicle*, s.a. 1162,[4] he calculates that the Church must have been completed during the early sixties.[5] Consequently he dates the *Life* to this earlier period. The absence in both the *Hypatian* and *Laurentian Chronicles* of any mention of plans to repair the damages caused by the fire, however, weakens the testimony of the *Tver Chronicle*. Nevertheless, since all the other churches of Andrej's reign were built during the first half of the 1160s, Voronin's hypothesis seems plausible.

There is further internal evidence for dating the *Life* to the early sixties:

the friendly relations between Andrej and Rostov. Until about 1164 Andrej and the Rostov clergy appear to have coöperated against Kievan ecclesiastical hegemony in resisting the candidacy of the Bishop Leon. Although rivalry between the older town and Andrej's rapidly rising Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma must have existed, mutual opposition to infringements on their autonomy by the Metropolitanate favored amicable relations. After 1164 Andrej's alliance with Rostov against Kiev began to crumble.[6] It is doubtful that a literary work friendly to both parties could have been composed during the ensuing years of tension and rivalry.

The degree to which the people of Rostov share the limelight with Andrej suggests not only collaboration between the two parties but even the possibility of the Rostovian origin of the *Life*. If the *Life* was not of Rostovian origin, it clearly was designed by Bogoljubskij mythologists to cater to the people of Rostov. Rostovians are more prominent in some passages than the Prince himself. Andrej is initially reluctant to replace the burned church with a building of comparable size. He is persuaded with difficulty (*edvaže*) by the people of Rostov. The Prince's reluctance to make the decision which precipitates the discovery of the Saint's relics enhances the role of the people of Rostov: without their appeals, the miracle of Leontius might not have occurred in Andrej's time. And later, when Leontius's body is discovered, the Prince is not present. He is (implicitly) in Vladimir and has to be informed of the miracle by messenger. Again, Rostovians mediate between Prince and saint.

In addition to dating and authorship problems, we must try to distinguish those parts of the text which derive from the hypothetical original from those which do not. Aside from one thirteenth-century copy, five other versions of the *Life* exist; composed between the fifteenth and the seventeenth centuries, these renditions differ substantially from the earliest one, particularly with respect to the political significance of Andrej's cult of Leontius.[7] Colored by Muscovite political ideology, the later versions enhance the Prince's political status. For example, whereas the oldest version depicts him as "Christ-loving Prince" (*xristoljubivyj knjaz'*), the later ones describe him as "most honorable tsar" (*blagočestivyj car'*). According to the earliest version the Rostov Land is Andrej's *deržava*, but according to the later ones the territory is his *carstvie*.[8] Moreover, the efficacy of Leontius' miracles is confined in the earliest version to the Rostov Land; in the later ones the miracles affect "all Orthodox Christians."[9] We are told in the thirteenth century that the Bishop was born and raised in Constantinople; nothing more is said of his life prior to his mission in Rostov. Later versions embellish the story of Leontius' Byzantine experience even to include an

association with the ninth-century Patriarch Photius, who is said to have been responsible for the Bishop's appointment to Rostov.[10]

Leontius' Byzantine origin, as well as his two Greek predecessors, were probably the author's inventions. The *Patericon* of the Kiev Cave Monastery claims that Leontius was a *graždanin' russkogo mira.* Originally a monk at this monastery, the source adds, he later became the first Bishop of Rostov. Because of his suffering from the unbelievers in his see he died a martyr, "crowned by Christ for Whom he suffered."[11] The author's invention of Leontius' Byzantine origin should not astonish the reader familiar with other political works of Bogoljubskij's time. In the *Bulgar Narration* and the *Laurentian Chronicle* entry on the affair of Leon we find other fictitious affiliations with Byzantium.[12]

The *Patericon* provides a clue about the time of Leontius' experience in Rostov when it states that Bishop Isaiah succeeded him.[13] We know from the *Russian Primary Chronicle* that Isaiah was Bishop of Rostov by 1089.[14] According to the *Tver Chronicle* Isaiah became Bishop in 1072;[15] the *Life of Isaiah of Rostov* dates the inception of his episcopacy to 1077.[16] The latter source, too, indicates that Leontius was Isaiah's predecessor.[17] It is generally assumed, therefore, that Leontius died shortly before the commencement of Isaiah's episcopacy, conceivably in 1071 at the time of the conflict with the *volxvy* mentioned in the *Primary Chronicle.*[18]

Assuming, then, that we can isolate the hypothetical original text and approximate when it was penned, we can proceed to an analysis of its ideological implications. The *Life of Leontius of Rostov* celebrates above all the shared piety of Prince Andrej and the people of Rostov; the theme of interdependence is paramount.

The Rostovians are clearly acknowledged as the first of the newly enlightened in the land where Prince Andrej would eventually rule. Leontius does not ". . . direct his teaching toward the older ones . . . , blinded by their disbelief." Rather, he instructs the young children of Rostov, whom he saves from the arms and sticks of their recalcitrant elders. These young children of Rostov, of course, are the first Christians of Andrej's principality. It is interesting to note that the people of the Rostov Land are called "newly enlightened" in another work associated with Prince Andrej's reign — the *Narration of the Miracles.*[19] But in the *Life of Leontius* it is the people specifically of the town of Rostov, not generally of the land.

The historic piety of the people of Rostov is rewarded with a miracle: a saint is discovered in their town. And who should share the discovery but Andrej himself. It all happened, the *Life* relates, as a result of the Rostov fire and the trench digging for the foundation of a new church. Persuaded

by the pious Christians of Rostov, Andrej orders the building of a large church to replace the burned edifice. The decision precipitates the discovery of Leontius' tomb under the south wall of the old church. The coffin is opened and the people of Rostov are dumbfounded to find "his face shining like a light" and "his garments . . . as if they had been placed on him the day before"; "his holy body had not deteriorated," neither had the coffin which contained it. The condition of Leontius' body recalls that of some of the saintly relics of Kiev. Like Leontius' remains, Theodosius' "members were not separated and the hair of the head still adhered."[20] Similarly, Boris and Gleb's bodies were "completely intact and their faces were shining like angels."[21] The unimpaired condition of the body is, of course, a hagiographical *topos*, one which suggests the extraordinary sanctity of the Rostov Land.

Andrej immediately grasps the significance of the discovery and prays to the Lord:

> O Lord Jesus Christ, how shall I repay You for all You have given me [Ps. 116: 12] since in all this land, in the territory under my rule (*dr'žava*) You caused this treasure to be revealed? . . . What You kept from the clever and the wise You revealed to the young.

The Prince is grateful that he is singled out for such an honor and that the "young" (i.e. contemporary) people of his land — not the "wise" — were the beneficiaries of divine providence. Just as the icon of the Virgin chose Andrej's principality for its resting place, so God chose Andrej's *deržava*, and with it Rostov itself, for the miraculous revelation of the saintly body. Leontius' remains were added testimony to the piety of the land of the "young," ruled by the pious and Christ-loving Prince Andrej.

Just as Kiev could boast Theodosius and Boris and Gleb, so, now, the Rostov Land boasted Leontius and a special claim to sanctity. In addition to the Virgin of Vladimir the principality had another sacred shrine — the relics of the saintly Leontius which rested in the Church of the Virgin built by order of "the God-protected and pious Prince Andrej, son of the Grand Prince Jurij, the grandson of Vladimir."

The shrine was in Rostov, not Vladimir. Sacralization found its way to the old town as well as the new. The *Life of Leontius of Rostov* tells us that Prince Andrej knew and accepted the necessity of blending "old" and "new," Rostov and Vladimir. The power of the old is here elevated and spiritualized into a sacred presence, always there, but only made manifest by the shared, "new" religiosity of Prince and Rostovians. Rostov endowed the new promised land with an apostle honored above all by the pious Prince Andrej.

Conclusion

The political myths created during and directly after the reign of Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij form an image of a ruler close to God. They stress the imminence of the Rostov Land, especially Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma, to heaven, through whose door descend signs of divine support. The tearing and flaming of an icon, the protective beneficence of an intercessory garment, the unblemished relics of a holy one — miracle upon miracle display the sacredness of the Prince's chosen mission.

We learn from these myths, too, of a prince highly conscious of the protection he received from on high. We watch Andrej praying to the Virgin in stunned reverence for her miraculous support. We watch him honor miracles with sacred shrines and sacred days. We behold a Solomon-like prince building architectural and literary monuments to the Lord; a chosen prince eager to reign over a chosen land; a prince unencumbered by worldly impediments to the fulfillment of the divine command which he made his own.

Such was the myth of the man as Andrej himself and his entourage of clerical supporters made it. It was a myth of unusual persistence and richness designed to legitimate and to sacralize changes in the political and ecclesiastical structure of *Rus'*.

Andrej's "new Jerusalem," Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma, housed the most powerful prince of the Rurikid clan and earned the privilege of quartering the bishop of the see of Rostov. It was a town far from war-torn Kiev but created in its holy image. Andrej's chosen city boasted a new princely palace and a dazzling display of churches visible to all as symbols of a newly sacralized presence.

Vladimir grew to pre-eminence in a period of intense internecine struggle and political disintegration, when many doubted their commitment to autocratic rule. In his quest for *samovlastie* Prince Andrej fought against overwhelming odds with disarming determination. For an entire decade he ruled the *Rus'* land. Yet his ambitions for Vladimir were thwarted by opponents from Kiev, Constantinople and Rostov, antagonistic to the city of the new and still more to the Prince who created it. Their resentment of the ambitious ruler yielded one of the bloodiest murders to cross the pages of the chronicles of *Rus'*.

The murdered Prince was a true hero in the history of Russia. Within two centuries the tsars of Moscow would assume those same prerogatives of translation which Andrej had utilized so boldly and so tragically in his own time. Yet when Muscovite mythmakers seized upon Andrej's creative role in the formation of their tsardom, they went too far. Andrej tried — desperately — to replace Kiev with Vladimir, but he only partially succeeded. We must recognize him as an enormously creative and ambitious appanage prince — not as Russia's first tsar.

Appendix One

"Gramata caregradskago patriarxa Luki Xrizoverga k Andreju Bogoljubskomu, Makarij, *Istorija russkoj cerkvi* III (St. Petersburg, 1868), Appendix 2, 298–300.

Грамата цареградскаго патріарха Луки Хрисоверга къ Андрею Боголюбскому

"Грамота великого Патріарха Луки ко князю Ондрею Ростовскому, Боголюбскому.

Любимый о Господи, духовный сыну, преблагородный Княже Ростовъскій и Суздальскій! Грамота благородія твоего къ нашему смиренію твоимъ посломъ принесена бысть и прочтена бысть в соборѣ. Увѣдавше на ней, оже въ твоей земли твоимъ почтаніемъ благочестіе умиряется, яко многи по мѣстомъ молебныа домы создалъ еси Богу, доброе се твое почтаніе вси похвалихомъ, и еже къ Богу, правую твою вѣру готовахомъ, и не токмо же грамотою благородія твоего сія извѣствовахомъ, но отъ того самого епископа твоего многа благая о благородіи твоемъ, и свидѣтельствова предъ нашимъ смиреніемъ и предъ Божественнымъ Соборомъ, и предъ державнымъ нашимъ святымъ царемъ. Сказываетъ же намъ писаніе твое, иже градъ Володимерь изъ основанія воздвиглъ еси великъ со многомъ человѣкъ, въ немъ же и церкви многи создалъ еси. Не хощеши же его быти подъ правдами епископьи Ростовскіа и Суздальскіа, но обновити е митрополіею и поставити отъ насъ въ не митрополита. тамо сущаго у благородія твоего Θеодора. Да еже убо о градѣ твоемъ, иже внемъ святыхъ церквей, яже воздвиглъ еси на славу Богу: но той ти множицею благородію твоему воздаеть; а еже отъяти таковый градъ отъ правды епископьи Ростовскіа и Суждальскіа и быти ему митрополіею — не мощно есть то. Да вѣдомо буди благородію твоему; понеже бо, якоже слышимъ, оже не иноя страны есть ни области таковый градъ; не ново бо есть зашелъ къ любви и къ твоему княженію нынѣ бы приложенъ. но тое же самое земли и области есть, въ ней (же) сути

прадѣди твои были; и ты самъ обладаеши ею нынѣ, въ ней же едина епископья была издавна, и единъ епископъ во всей земли той. Славимъ же по временомъ священнымъ Митрополитомъ всеа Руси, еже есть отъ насъ святыя и великія церкве, ставимъ и посылаемъ тамо; а не можемъ мы того сотворити, занеже явѣ съвъпрашати сважатися съ Божественными и священными правилы. Правила убо святыхъ Апостолъ и Божественныхъ отецъ каяждо митрополіа и епископья цѣли не порушимо своя держати оправданiа повелѣли, и никто же отъ святыхъ можетъ Божественныхъ и священныхъ преступити правилъ, аще не страненъ отъ Бога хощетъ быти.

Прочтохомъ же и присланые грамоты твои, на нихъ же біаху обинныи вины на Боголюбиваго епископа твоего. А понеже увѣдахомъ и сященного Митрополита грамотою епископъ, и отъ самого посла деръжавнаго и святаго нашего царя, и отъ инѣхъ многихъ, оже таковая епископа твоего обиненiа молвена суть многажды по своемъ тамо у васъ соборѣ и предъ великимъ княземъ всея Руси, пришедшимъ о томъ нѣкымъ мужемъ благородія твоего, явилася не крѣпка. якоже бы епископу спакостити, и оправленъ убо сій епископъ своимъ сборомъ; и неподобно, и мы мнѣхомъ, отинудъ того порядити, занеже суть истязанна тамо; яко бо и священная правила не велятъ намъ того творити, иже велятъ коемуждо епископу своимъ соборомъ судитися. Но понеже епископъ, надеяся на свою правду, прележаше моляся намъ истязати паки намъ, таковая намъ послушахомъ молбы, и прочтохомъ иже на него благородіемъ твоимъ присланую грамоту. А понеже противу которой винѣ своей во правду силнѣ но правиломъ отвѣщалъ есть, и оправданъ есть нами, и въ службу его с собою пріяхомъ, и служилъ съ нами. И се же епископъ твоему благородію посланъ, какъ и отъ самого Бога, нашимъ смиреніемъ, Божественымь и священнымъ великимъ соборомъ. И извѣстно надѣемся, яко не восхощешися противити суду всѣхъ святитель и нашему смиренію, и, просто, аще хощеши имѣти часть съ Богомъ, смѣсившаго небесная и земная своимъ къ намъ сшествіемъ, и благословенія великіа соборныя церкве и молитвъ всѣхъ, иже здѣ сшедшихся, святитель и нашего смиреніа, духовный отчей сыну! Всяку убо, юже имѣеши жалобу и да въ души своей на Боголюбиваго епископа своего, сложи съ сердца своего; с радостію же его пріими, со всякою тихостію и любовію, яко же Божіею благодатію достойна суща яко и слова почтена, и добродѣтелію свѣтящее, и смысломъ украшена и свѣдаетъ право паствити и управливати порученное ему Богомъ стадо. А пастыря имѣя яже не такого, то болѣ не проси иного, но имѣ его, яко святителя, и отца. и

учителя. и пастыря и пріими его опять въ свою землю. да паствитъ Божіе стадо, да не забываетъ. ожели то твое благородіе будетъ в томъ грѣсѣ. Пусти же ему строити своея церкве, яко же благодать Святаго Духа въздаетъ ему; се бо и Богу и человѣкомъ есть угодно. Аще ли твое благородіе годующе хощеть жити въ созданнѣмъ тобою градѣ, а хотѣти начнетъ и епископъ въ немъ с тобою быти, да будетъ сій Боголюбивый епископъ твой с тобою; въ томъ бо ему нестъ пакости, занеже есть таковый градъ подъ областію его. Ожели паки, якоже не имамъ вѣры, ни дай Богъ быти, по его оправленіи и священнымъ Митрополитомъ всеа Руси, и его епископы и нашимъ совершенымъ утверженіежъ отнюдь, — а не будешь к нему, якоже подобаеть, ни повинутися начнеши его поученіемъ и показаніемъ, но и еще начнеши гонити сего, Богомъ ти данного святителя и учителя, повинуяся инѣмъ чрезъ законъ поученіемъ, а вѣдомо ти буди, благословеный сыну, то аще всего міра исполниши церкви и грады и возградиши паче числа, гониши же епископа, главу церковную и людскую, то не церкви, то хлѣви, ни единоя жити". . . .

Appendix Two

"Skazanie o pobede nad Bolgarami" (I. E. Zabelin, "Sledy literaturnogo truda Andreja Bogoljubskogo," *Arxeologičeskie izvestija i zametki,* II (1895), 45–46.)

Мц҃а августа въ а҃ днь празднуемъ все м҃лтивому Х҃у Б҃гу нашему и преч҃тѣи его мт҃ри.

Вѣдѣти есть о сем нам возлюбленаа братіа пантократорныи дн҃ъ мл҃ти Бжіа празднуемъ. Бл҃гоч҃тивому и вѣрному цр҃ю нашему кн҃зю Андрею уставившу с҃е праздновати со цр҃ем Мануихом повелѣніемъ Луки патриарха и митрополита Костянтина всея Руси и Нестера еп҃па Ростовьска҃. Мануилу ц҃рю мирно в҆любви и братолюбіи живущу съ бл҃гоч҃тивымъ кн҃земъ нашимъ Андрѣем случися имъ въ единъ д҃нь изити на брань, оному изо ц҃ряграда на Срацины, а сему из Ростова на Болгары. Обычай же имѣаше кн҃зь Андрѣи егда к воеви (на брань, на бой) идяху всегда чистою дш҃ею и иконоу влд҃чца нашеа Бдца пр҃нодв҃ыа Мр҃іа и Кр҃тъ прозвитера два въ с҃щенных ризах ношаху и ту пріиметь ѡт с҃тых таинъ плоти и крови Гп҃я и сущіи с ним гл҃я се: Влдчце Бце родив҆ши Х҃а Б҃га нашего уповааи на тя весь не погибнеть. Азъ рабъ твои имѣю тя стѣну и покровъ и Кр҃тъ Сн҃а твоего ѡружіе на брани ѡбоюду ѡстро и ѡгнь ѡпаляа лица противных наших хотящих с нами брани. И падоша вси на колѣну пред ст҃ою Бц҃ею со слезами целующе.

И (тогда) взяша четыри городы Бол҆гарьскіа Е҃ и бряхимовъ в (на) Камѣ и воротивсе ѡт сѣча вси и видѣша (всвѣтима) луча ѡгнены ѡт иконы Сп҃са нашего влдки и Б҃га и весь полкъ его ѡт крытъ (окрестъ) ѡн же воротився ѡпять и попали городы ѡгнемъ и положи землю ту пусту а прочіи городи ѡсади дань платити. Тож҃ видѣніе Мануилъ ц҃рь (видѣ у себѣ) тамо видѣ въ единъ д҃нь августа въ а҃ праздновати уставиша мл҃ти бж҃іа чл҃колюбіа яко же рече пророкъ его же хощю помилую помилованъ будеть и н҃нѣ влд҃ко тако покры вса люди р҃уськіа земля уповающаа на тя тѣмъ вси припадаем ти гл҃юще Г҃и і҃се х҃е что ти воздамы ѡ всѣх яже воздалъ еси нам веліи еси Г҃и и чюдна дѣла твоя и величію твоему н҃ѣ конца врѡд и рѡд восхвалятъ

дѣла твоя бл҃венъ г҃ь б҃гъ иже недасть н҃а во плѣнъ врагом но҃ самъ призри на ны мл҃тію своею и чл҃колюбіем защити ны и съ славою вознеси десницоу оуповающих на тя и мт҃рьне моленіе оуслыша и помиловая люди своя мл҃тію ч҃лколюбіа своего ц҃ркви исполнися славы своея (твоея) влдко юже яко дверь показалъ еси нб҃ноую на земли в неиж ти ся молимъ г҃люще г҃и призри съ высоты нб’се и виждь и посѣти винограда своего сверши еже насади десница твоя ст҃аа всѣх бо ѡчи вл҃дко на тя оуповають твоея мл҃ти и щедроты чающе хвалы и пѣніе славѣ твоеи всылаемъ прослави самъ славою оуповающих на тя многоименитаго бг҃а и сп҃са нашег҃ ты бо пр҃тлъ н҃бо имѣа подножіе землю призри мл҃тивныма своима ѡчима на вся люди оуповающаа на тя и на прч҃тоую твою м҃трь и на вся с҃тыа твоя иже пострадаша за имя твое ѡ н҃а грѣшных тебѣ моленіа приносящих.

Аз же написах ти се (сице) повелѣніемъ ц҃ря Маноуила и всего причта ц҃рковнаго да праздноуимъ обще вси м҃ца авгоу҃та, въ а҃ д҃нь вседержителя г҃а б’га нашего чл҃колюбца мл҃тію и ст҃на его м҃три блгд҃тію застоупляеми ѡт всѣх бѣдъ и болѣзни и ѡт вр҃га видимых и невидимых и побѣдоу ѡт неа (нею) имоущи на враги по велицеи ею мл҃ти праздноуемъ има вкоупѣ. Го҃у бго҃у нашему и прч҃теи его м҃три авгоу҃та въ а҃ дн҃ь Маковѣи оуставихомъ якоже и в Костянтинѣ градѣ оуставиша с҃тіи ѡтци бл҃говѣрніи пантократоръ м҃лти бж’іа и чл҃колюбіа тако и сіи праздникъ оуставленъ бы҃ хоудым и грѣшным рабомъ Бжіим Андрѣемъ кн҃земъ сн҃омъ Георгіевым вноука Мономахова именемъ Володимера цря и кн҃зя всея Роусіи.

ѡт многомл҃тиве вседръжителю неизречение едине чл҃колюбче г҃и Бж҃е нашь. Преч҃тая г҃же бц҃е д҃во рождьшіа всѣх творца г҃а нашего. чистаа Мт҃и бго҃у бл҃венаа поюща’а тя вѣрою спс҃аи напасти и молву ѿгонящи мл҃тивно яко (бг҃а) рожьдшіи все елико хощеши и свер’шаеши не възбранно и можеши дв҃це еже не ѡсрамляета всѣх притѣкающих к вама со страхом с вѣрою и любовію. Тако и мнѣ грѣшномоу и недостоимоу рабоу твоему Андрею приложита не изреченныа мл҃ти своея свыше посылающе ѡт тебе бо влдко и прч҃таа м҃ти Бж҃іа всякодааніе бл҃го и дари свершени посылаются оуповающимъ на тя с вѣрою всегда и в бесконечныи вѣкъ аминь.

Appendix Three

From "Žitie Andreja Jurodivogo," *Velikie minei čet'i,* Oktjabr' (St. Petersburg, 1870), coll. 207–208.

О видѣніи святыя Богородици Влахернѣ

Неусыпающіи служ'бѣ бывающіи во святѣй церкви сущіи Влахернахъ, идеже блажен'ный Андрѣй таможе обычая дѣя своя, бѣаше же Епифанъ і отрокъ его единъ с нимъ, да стояху другойци до полуноши, а другойци до свѣта. Часу же ношному сущю четвертому, узрѣ блажен'ный Андрѣй святую Богородицю очивѣсть вельми сущю высоку, пришедшю царьскими враты страшнами слугами, в них'же бѣаше честный Предтеча и громный сынъ, обаполу державщу ю, і инѣи святци мнози в'бѣлахъ ризахъ идяху предъ нею, а друзіи по ней с пѣснеми духовными. Да егда же пріиде близъ амбона, пріиде святець ко Епифанови, и рече: видиши ли Госпожю всего мира и Царицю? Он'же рече: вижю, отче мой! И сима зрящима. преклон'ши колѣни, на многы часы молитися нача слезами кропящи боговид'ное свое лице. И по молитвѣ пріиде ко алтарю молящися о стоящихъ людей тамо. Да егда ся отмоли, амафоръ ся яко молніино видѣніе имѣя, еже на пречистѣмъ ея версѣ лежаше, отвив'ши отъ себѣ пречистыма рукама своима в'зем'ши, страш'но же и велико суще, верху всѣхъ людей простре стоящихъ ту, еже на многы часы видѣсте святца верху людей простерто суще и сіая, якоже иликторъ, славу Божію, да доньдѣже бѣаше тамо святая Богородица видѣсте и та, а понелѣже отъиде, и боле того не видѣсте; взяла бо будеть съ собою, а благодать оставила есть сущимъ тамо.

Appendix Four

"Proložnoe Skazanie," *Velikie minei čet'i,* Oktjabr' (St. Petersburg, 1870), coll. 4–5.

В той же день празднуемъ Покровъ святѣй Богородици. О видѣніи святаго Андрѣя і Епифаніа, како видѣста на въздусѣ святую Богородицю.

Страшно и чюд'но видѣніе чест'ною свят'цю Ан'дрѣа і Епифаніа, како видѣста на въздусѣ святую Богородицю, пришедъшу Влахерну въ святую церковь съ ангелы и съ Предтечею и съ Богослов'цемъ Іоанномъ и съ инѣми многыми святыми. Народу стоящу въ церкве, видѣста молящуся съ слезами къ Сыну си за весь миръ. И глагола Ан'дрѣй къ Епифанови: видиши ли Царицю и Госпожю всѣхъ молящися за миръ? Он' же рече: вижу, отче! И покрыв'ши честнымъ своимъ ом'форомъ, свѣтящися паче електора, люди сущая въ церкве. Се убо егда слыша, помышляхъ: како страш'ное и милосердное видѣніе, паче надѣяніе наше и заступленіе, бысть безъ праздника? Надѣя же ся, Владычице, на милосердая твоя словеса, еже къ Сыну си рече. моляши и глаголющи: Царю небесный, пріими всякого человѣка, славящаго тя и призывающаго имя твое на всякомъ мѣстѣ, идѣже бываеть паметь имени моего, святи мѣсто се и прослави прославляющаго тя || именемъ моимъ, пріемля ихъ всяку молитву и отвѣтъ. Тѣмъ словесемъ надѣяся, въсхотѣхъ, да не безъ праздника останетъ святый покровъ твой, преблагая; по якоже ты хощеши украсити честный праздникъ твоего покрова, всемилостивая, украси, да и прославляющіи тя възвеселят'ся, видяще многоимен'ны твоя праздникы сіающа; і якоже тамо сущая народы въ церкве милостивно покры, тако и насъ грѣшныхъ рабъ твоихъ покрый кровомъ крилу твоею, низлагающи съвѣты же и думы помышляющихъ на нь злая, и спаси ны по милости Сына твоего в сій вѣкъ и в' будущій, и вся притекающая къ тебѣ съ страхомъ и вѣрою, и надѣяся на тя, скорое наше заступленіе и помощь. Устави же ся таковый праздникъ праздновати мѣсяца Ок'тября въ 1 день, въ память святаго апостола Ананіи, въ славу Отца и Сына и Святаго Духа.

Appendix Five

"Žitie Leọnteja Rostov'skago," in "Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj duxovnoj pis'm̤ennosti," *Pravoslavnyj sobesednik* (Kazanskaja Duxovnaja Akademija, 1858), part 2, 301–311.

Мѣсяца маия въ кг҃ день обрѣтенье (честнаго тѣлесе) святаго святителя Леонтея епископа Ростовского чюдотворца.

Сеи бѣ блаженыи Костентина града рожение и въспитание. и за премногую его добродѣтель поставленъ бысть епископом граду Ростову, имже преже бывши ту епископи Ѳеодоръ и Ларіонь избѣгоша не терпяще невѣрия и досажения людии. сеи же блаженыи укрѣпився силою крестною и помощью всесвятыя Богородица. и пощением многим. и бдѣнием и научи я вѣровати Христови. и чюдеса преславна съдѣявъ҇ отъ нихже единою вмалѣ скажем. святому убо прилежащю учению и наказающу младыя дѣти отступити отъ лести идольстеи. и вѣровати бъ святую Троицу. Отца и Сына и Святаго Духа. имъже бо старии. омрачившеся невѣрьствием своим. не внимаху учению его. якоже сам истина Христосъ рече. яко вино ново въ новы мѣхи въливати. обое съблюдеться. аще въльеши вино ново бъ мѣхи ветхы. и мѣси просядутся. обое погибнуть. се блаженыи оставль старца и учаше младенца. а абие устремишася невѣрнии на святопомазаную главу. овии съ оружиемъ. а друзіи съ дреколием. яко изгнати изъ града и убити и. епископъ же нимало смутися. но паче укрѣпляше сущая съ нимъ прозвитеры и дияконы. глагола им. чадца не боитеся нахожения их. не могуть бо си нам без Божия повелѣния сътворити ничтоже. и абие облечеся въ священыя ризы. и повелѣ прозвитерам и диаконом облещися в ризы. и яко пріидоша и видѣша лице его. яко лице ангелу. и абие падоша мрътвии а друзии ослѣпоша. святыи же молитвою въстави я. здрави и цѣлы сътворы. и научи я вѣровати Христови. и крести я въ Святую Троицу Отца и Сына и Святаго Духа. и ина многа чюдеса памети достойна сотворивъ. къ Господу. егож измлада възлюби. с миром отъиде. положено бысть святое его и честное тѣло въ

церкви пречистыя Богородица. юже бѣ създалъ преже бывшии ту епископъ. посемъ же многым лѣтом минувшим. по Божию попущению. загоряся градъ Ростовъ и погорѣ мало не весь. и церкви погорѣ святыя Богородица. и повелѣ богохранимыи и благоверныи князь Андрѣи. сынъ великаго князя Георгия. внукъ Володимерь създати церковъ камену въ имя пречистыя Богородица на мѣстѣ погорѣвшея церкви. и начаша копати рвы. и обрѣтоша мрътвых множество. идѣже обрѣтоша и блаженаго Исаію. и бѣ церкви мала основана и начаша людіе молитися князю Ондрѣю. а бы повелѣлъ церковь болѣ заложити. едва ж умолилъ бывъ. повелѣ воли их быти. се же все да сбудеться Богом реченное въ святом еуангеліи. не можетъ град укрытися верху горы стоя. иниктоже въжегъ свѣтильникъ поставляеть его под сосудом или под одром. тако и сему свѣтильнику не мощно на толицѣ лѣтъ съкровену быти под землею. се бысть всемудраго Бога промысломъ. и скопающимъ ровъ преднѣи стѣнѣ. и обрѣтоша гробъ. и бѣ покровенъ двѣма досками. и людем недоуюмѣщимся и отврызоша гробъ. и вѣдѣша лице его свѣтящеся яко свѣтъ. и ризы его яко вчера облечены. о превеликое чюдо братия. толиком лѣтом минувше неизмѣнися божественное тѣло его. но и ризы его неистлѣша. паче же и гробъ. въ немже бѣ тѣло святое. видѣвше же людие. възрадовашеся радостию великою. и послаша вѣсть ко князю Андрѣю. повѣдаша ему бывшее чюдо преславное. слышавъ же князь прослави великую мудрость Божию. и помолися Богу глаголаше. Господе Исусе Христе. что ти въздамъ за вся яже въздалъ еси мнѣ. яко всеи области. в моеи дръжавѣ. сподобилъ еси сицему съкровищу откровену быти. и поминая спасеное слово глаголаше. яко утаилъ еси отъ премудрых и разумных. и открылъ еси младенцемъ. и посла въскорѣ гробъ каменъ положити в нем тѣла святаго. идѣже и нынѣ лежать въ церкви святыя Богородица. сдѣвая преславная чюдеса и подавая исцеления с вѣрою приходящим к пречистѣи госпожи Богородици. и рацѣ великаго святителя Леонтея, въ славу Христу Богу нашему и въдръжаву и побѣду христолюбивому князю. егда създаша церковъ камену в Ростовѣ на мѣстѣ погоревшая церкви повелѣнием благочестиваго князя нашего Андрѣя. онъ же пріѣхавъ въ Ростовъ к мужем своим. и поклонися блаженному и святому тѣлу Леонтееву глаголя. хвалю и славлю тя Господи Боже мои. и пречистою Матерь твою. яко сподобилъ мя еси сицего съкроего царствия видѣти. уже ничем же охужденъ есмъ. милости твоея дарова благодати Божия о сем святѣм мужѣи цѣлова святыя мощи и вси мужи его. и посем поставиша в рацѣ на стѣнѣ. идѣже и нынѣ. лежить. и устрои свѣщи великы у гроба его.

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1. P.S.R.L. II, col. 520.
2. *Ibid.,* col. 572.
3. *Ibid.,* col. 574.
4. *Ibid.,* col. 573.
5. P.S.R.L. IX–XIII.
6. P.S.R.L. XXI.
7. *Ibid.,* pp. 192–93.
8. P.S.R.L. I, col. 346; P.S.R.L. II, col. 482; "Skazanie o čudesax"; see also chapter IV.
9. P.S.R.L. XX, 387.
10. P.S.R.L. IX, 204; P.S.R.L. XXI, 192–93, 230.
11. P.S.R.L. IX, 209.
12. See chapter III and P.S.R.L. I, col. 352.
13. P.S.R.L. XXI, 222.
14. *Ibid.,* 234, 239. The seventeenth century "Žitie Andreja Bogoljubskogo" adds that Andrej was "*samoderžec' vsej Rossii,*" in Dobroxotov, *Drevnij Bogoljubov': Gorod i monastyr'* (M., 1852), 87.
15. P.S.R.L. I, col. 367. The *Hypatian Chronicle* calls Andrej "*velikij knjaz'... suzdal'skij*" at the time of his death (P.S.R.L. II, col. 580).
16. P.S.R.L. IX, 211; P.S.R.L. XII, 230.
17. P.S.R.L. XV, col. 21 (*Rogožskaja letopis'*); col. 226 (*Tverskaja letopis'*).
18. P.S.R.L. XXI, 222.
19. *Ibid.,* 230.
20. *Ibid.,* 240.
21. Text cited in M. A. Salmina, *Povesti o načale Moskvy* (M., L., 1964), 173–85.
22. M. P. Pogodin, *Knjaz Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij* (M., 1850), part i, 39.
23. S. M. Solov'ev, *Istorija Rossii* I (M., 1851, repr. 1959), 529.
24. S. M. Solov'ev, *Ob otnošenijax Novgoroda k' velikim' knjaz'jam'* (M., 1846), 17; *Istorija otnošenij meždu russkimi knjaz'jami Rjurikova doma* (M., 1847), 287–88.
25. Solov'ev, *Istorija Rossii* I, 674–75.
26. *Ibid.*
27. V. O. Ključevskij, *A History of Russia* I, tr. C. J. Hogarth (New York, 1960), 221.
28. *Ibid.*

29. *Ibid.*, 222.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*, 224.
32. *Ibid.*, 227.
33. V. Georgievskij, "Svjatyj blagovernyj velikij knjaz' Andrej Bogoljubskij: Ego neocenimyja zaslugi dlja russkogo gosudarstva i pravoslavnoj cerkvi," *Vladimirskija eparxjal'nyja vedomosti*, 18–24 (1896), 432.
34. A. E. Presnjakov, *Formation of the Great Russian State*, tr. A. E. Moorhouse (Chicago, 1970), 43.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*, 59.
37. *Ibid.*, 43–44.
38. *Ibid.*, 45.
39. M. K. Ljubavskij, *Obrazovanie osnovnoj gosudarstvennoj territorii velikorusskoj narodnosti: zaselenie i ob'edinenie centra* (L., 1929), 1–30.
40. M. N. Tixomirov, *Drevne-russkie goroda* (M., 1956), 392–404.
41. N. N. Voronin, "Vladimiro-Suzdal'skaja zemlja v X–XIII v.," *Problemy istorii dokapitalističeskix obščestv*, nos. 5–6 (1935); *Zodčestvo.*
42. S. M. Kaštanov, "Ob idealističeskoj traktovke nekotoryx voprosov istorii russkoj političeskoj mysli v zarubežnoj istoriografii," *Viz. vrem.*, XI (1956), 315–16.
43. I. Ju. Budovnic, *Obščestvenno-političeskaja mysl' drevnej Rusi* (M., 1960), 232–49.
44. B. D. Grekov, *Kiev Rus'*, tr. Y. Sdobnikov (M., 1959), 685.
45. *Ibid.*
46. Budovnic, *Mysl'*, 249.
47. B. A. Rybakov, *Early Centuries of Russian History*, tr. John Weir (M., 1965), 218.
48. *Ibid.*, 220.
49. See above, n. 41 and part two of this book.
50. See A. A. Nasonov, *Russkaja zemlja i obrazovanie territorii drevenorusskogo gosudarstva* (M., 1951); and C. Halperin, "The Concept of the Russian Land," *Russian History* II, i (1975), 29–38.
51. The oldest chronicles which discuss the history of the region, the *Hypatian* (P.S.R.L. II) and the *Laurentian* (P.S.R.L. I), refer to it as the *Rostovskaja zemlja* or occasionally as the *Suzdal'skaja zemlja.* Only the Muscovite chroniclers and subsequent historians of Russia adopt the joint titles *Rostovo-Suzdal'skaja zemlja* and *Vladimiro-Suzdal'skaja zemlja*, as well as the geographically descriptive title *zalesskaja zemlja.* A detailed geographical survey of the area can be found in N. N. Voronin, "Vladimiro-Suzdal'skaja zemlja v X–XIII vv.," *Problemy istorii dokapitalističeskix obščestv*, nos. 5–6 (1935).

CHAPTER I

1. On the early history of the region see M. Ljubavskij, *Russkaja istoričeskaja geografija v svjazi s istoriej kolonizacii* (M., 1909), 1–34.

2. See A. N. Nasonov, *"Russkaja zemlja" i obrazovanie territorii drevnerusskogo gosudarstva* (M., 1951), 173–96.

3. *Zodčestvo*, 21–23.

4. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 10, 20. See also D. Korsakov, *Merja i Rostovskoe knjažestvo* (Kazan, 1872).

5. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 10, 20. The towns of Rostov and Beloozero are ninth century (or earlier) foundations. See M. N. Tixomirov, *Drevnerusskie goroda* (M., 1956), 398, 421.

6. P.S.R.L. I, col. 20.

7. *Ibid.*, coll. 23–24.

8. *Ibid.*, col. 31.

9. *Ibid.*, col. 121.

10. *Ibid.*, coll. 121,369; P.S.R.L. II, col. 587.

11. P.S.R.L. I, col. 147. The "*volxvy*" may have been Slavs or non-Slavs (Finns, Bulgars). See S. M. Juškov, *Obščestvenno-političeskij stroj i pravo Kievskogo gosudarstva* (M., 1949), 72.

12. *Zodčestvo*, 24.

13. See chapter II and chapter VII.

14. P.S.R.L. I, col. 247 (the *Poučenie* of Vladimir Monomax).

15. *Ibid.*, coll. 241–252.

16. *Ibid.*, coll. 236–257.

17. *Paterik*, 5.

18. *Zodčestvo*, 27–50; Tixomirov, *Drevnerusskie goroda*, 312–402.

19. *Paterik*, 11–12: I v' svoem' knjaženii xristoljubec' Vladimer' v'zem' meru božestvenya toja cerkve Pečerskya vsem podobiem' s'zda cerkov' v' grade Rostove — v' vysotu i v' širotu i v' dolgotu no i pismja na xartii napisav' ideže kyiždo prazdnik' v koem' meste napisan' est' i sia vsja v' čin' i v' podobie s'tvori po obrazu velikyja toa cerkve bogoznamenanya.

20. P.S.R.L. I, col. 445.

21. *Zodčestvo*, 35–36.

22. According to the *Patericon* of the Kiev Cave Monastery (*Paterik*, 5), Jurij stayed behind in Kiev when his father gave him the principality of Rostov. The "Rostov tysjacskij" Georgij went to Suzdal' in his stead. In 1107 Jurij married the daughter of the Cuman khan Aepa (P.S.R.L. I, coll. 282–83), presumably in Kiev. Jurij's presence in the Suzdal' area is first mentioned s.a. 1120 when he attacked the Volga Bulgars (P.S.R.L. II, coll. 285–86). Jurij did not reappear near Kiev until 1149.

23. *Zodčestvo*, 55.

24. *Ibid.*, 53–62. The Kiev Cave *Patericon* indicates that Jurij lived in Suzdal'. *Paterik*, 12.

25. *Zodčestvo*, 63–110.

26. According to the Kiev Cave *Patericon* (*Paterik*, 12) Jurij modelled his church in Suzdal' on Monomax's churches.

27. P.S.R.L. II, coll. 339–490.

28. A. E. Presnjakov, *Knjažoe pravo v drevnej Rusi* (St. Petersburg, 1909), 103–04.

29. P.S.R.L. I, col. 330; P.S.R.L. II, col. 418.

30. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 282–83.

31. Such is the approximation of Andrej's birthdate by Pogodin. Pogodin, *Knjaz' Andrej*, Part I, 2–3.

32. P.S.R.L. I, col. 335: "[Andrej] ide v' svoju volost' Volodimerju."

33. Andrej's marriage to Ulita Kučkova is purely fictional. See Introduction, 0.

34. P.S.R.L. II, col. 350.

35. *Ibid.*

36. Pogodin, *Knjaz' Andrej*, Part I, 4.

37. According to the *Tver Chronicle* Jurij's mother was a Bulgarian (P.S.R.L. XV, coll. 250–54), possibly a second wife of Andrej. See V. de Baumgarten, *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes du Xe au XIIIe siècles, Orientalia Christiana* XXXV (1927), 27–29. According to the anonymous (Georgian) history of the reign of Empress Tamara, one Abul-Asan, a councillor of state, said "I know the son of the *gosudar'* Andrew the Great, the Russian prince, who has under his will thirty thousand Russian princes; the son left his father at an early age and was expelled by his uncle Savalt [Vsevolod Bol'šoe Gnezdo]." Cited in S. T. Eremjan, "Jurij Bogoljubskij v armjanskix i gruzinskix istočnikax," *Naučnye trudy Erevanskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta Im. V. M. Molotova* XXIII (1946), 389–421. Another Georgian chronicler, Basili, reports that a council requested the marriage to which Tamara strenuously objected out of disgust with Jurij's barbaric behavior. She consented to the marriage in order to produce an heir. Several years passed and no heir appeared. Jurij, who had by that time become a drunkard, was expelled from the kingdom. Cited in V. Dondua, "Basili, istorik caricy Tamary," *Pamjatniki epoxi Rustaveli* (L., 1938), 33–76.

38. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 323–26; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 386–92.

39. P.S.R.L. I, col. 329; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 404–05.

40. P.S.R.L. I, col. 335.

41. No chronicle actually stipulates that Andrej participated in Jurij's campaign of 1154–55, but only that "Jurij went from Suzdal' with his children . . ." (P.S.R.L. II, col. 480) to take Kiev.

42. P.S.R.L. II, col. 478.

43. *Ibid.*

44. *Ibid.*, col. 482.

45. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 346–374; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 482–599.

46. For a discussion of the political ideology revealed in the "Letopis' Andreja Bogoljubskogo," see chapter III.

47. "Skazanie o čudesax," 33 and chapter IV.

48. P.S.R.L. II, col. 478.

49. P.S.R.L. I, col. 348; P.S.R.L. II, col. 490.

50. P.S.R.L. II, col. 595. On the breaking of the oath see A. Nasonov, "Knjaz' i gorod v Rostovo-Suzdal'skoj zemle," *Veka*, V, 1–27.

51. P.S.R.L. I, col. 348; P.S.R.L. II, col. 491.

52. P.S.R.L. I, col. 348; P.S.R.L. II, col. 491. See *Zodčestvo*, 128–48.

53. *Ibid.*

54. P.S.R.L. I, col. 351.

55. *Ibid.*

56. *Ibid.* On the dating of Pokrov-na-Nerli, see *Zodčestvo*, 262.

57. P.S.R.L. II, col. 580.
58. *Zodčestvo,* 117.
59. On the Bogoljubskij *zamok* see *ibid.*, 201–61.
60. P.S.R.L. I, col. 351 (s.a. 1164): the *Laurentian Chronicle* mentions only one expulsion — Leon's. The *Hypatian* account is more complete: P.S.R.L. II, coll. 493, 520.
61. P.S.R.L. II, 520.
62. *Ibid.*, 531. The whereabouts of Otskalan' escapes the writer. Presumably it was located on the Danube together with Vasil'ko's possessions. During this period Emperor Manuel was anxious to acquire the assistance of the princes of Russia in his wars with Hungary. The Byzantine historian Cinnamus confirms the *Hypatian* chronicler's report about Vasil'ko's Danubian possessions. (*Historia*, ed. A. Meineke, C.S.H.B., Bonn, 1836, 236–37.
63. Rostislav received a friendly Byzantine embassy in 1164. P.S.R.L. II, col. 522.
64. P.S.R.L. I, col. 351; P.S.R.L. II, col. 520.
65. P.S.R.L. I, col. 352.
66. Jurij, too, had been obliged to contend with the Bulgars. (P.S.R.L. II, coll. 285–86).
67. See A. P. Smirnov, *Volžskie Bulgary* (M., 1951), 44ff.
68. See chapter V.
69. P.S.R.L. I, col. 353.
70. *Ibid.*, col. 350.
71. *Ibid.*
72. P.S.R.L. II, coll. 509–10.
73. P.S.R.L. I, col. 351; P.S.R.L. II, col. 511.
74. *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov* (M., L., 1950), 218.
75. P.S.R.L. II, col. 598.
76. *Ibid.*, col. 591. See also T. S. Noonan, "Suzdalia's Eastern Trade in the Century before the Mongol Conquest," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, XIX (4), 1978, 371–84.
77. *Zodčestvo,* 115.
78. *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, 219–20.
79. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 353–55; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 535–37.
80. P.S.R.L. I, col. 355; P.S.R.L. II, col. 537.
81. *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, 221; P.S.R.L. I, coll. 361–62.
82. *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, 221.
83. *Ibid.*, 222.
84. *Ibid.*
85. *Ibid.*, 223.
86. P.S.R.L. I, col. 364; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 564–65.
87. P.S.R.L. I, col. 365; P.S.R.L. II, col. 566.
88. P.S.R.L. II, coll. 568–78; P.S.R.L. I, coll. 363–64.
89. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 355–57.
90. P.S.R.L., I, col. 364; P.S.R.L. II, col. 565.
91. P.S.R.L. I, col. 369; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 585–89. Andrej Bogoljubskij's skele-

ton was removed from its resting place in Vladimir's Uspenskij Sobor for analysis in 1935 by D. G. Roxlin and V. S. Majkova-Stroganova. They report that he was 170 centimeters tall and that his body was severely injured. Cf. "Rentgenoantropologičeskoe issledovanie skeleta Andreja Bogoljubskogo," *Problemy istorii dokapitalističeskix obščestv* IX (1935), 155–61.

92. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 370–86; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 589–603.

93. P.S.R.L. I, col. 367; P.S.R.L. II, col. 580. It was extremely rare in Kiev *Rus'* for the title "*velikii knjaz'*" to be used in any but a posthumous fashion. See Ja. H. Ščapov, *Kniazeskie ustavy i tserkov' v drevnej Rusi* (M., 1972), 134.

94. Andrej is never called "Grand Prince of Vladimir" in the oldest chronicles. According to the accounts of his murder he was "grand prince" (*velikij knjaz'*) (P.S.R.L. I, col. 367) or "grand prince of Suzdal'" (P.S.R.L. II, col. 580).

95. P.S.R.L. II, col. 593.

96. See chapter III.

CHAPTER II

1. P.S.R.L. I.
2. P.S.R.L. II.
3. P.S.R.L. XI.
4. C.S.H.B. XXVI (ed. Bonn, 1836), hereafter Cinnamus.
5. C.S.H.B. XXIII (ed. Bonn, 1835), hereafter Choniates.
6. See chapter II, nn. 33, 38.
7. To be discussed later in this chapter, pp. 29ff.
8. See *ibid.*, 35.
9. See *ibid.*, 36.
10. Makarij, *Istorija russkoj cerkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1868); E. Golubinskij, *Istorija russkoj cerkvi* (M., 1901); A. V. Kartašev, *Očerki po istorii russkoj cerkvi*, I (Paris, 1959).
11. M. D. Priselkov, *Očerki po cerkovno-političeskoj istorii Kievskoj Rusi X–XII vekov* (St. Petersburg, 1913).
12. P. Sokolov, *Russkij arxierej iz Vizantii i pravo ego naznačenija do načala XV veka* (Kiev, 1913). See also V. Georgievskij, "Svjatyj Blagovernyj Velikij Knjaz' Andrej Bogoljubskij: Ego neocenimyja zaslugi dlja russkogo gosudarstva i pravoslavnoj cerkva," *Vladimirskija eparxjal'nyja vedomosti* (1894), 18–23, 427–663.
13. *Zodčestvo*; N. N. Voronin, "Andrej Bogoljubskij i Luka Xrizoverg: Iz istorii russko-vizantijskix otnošenii XII v.," *Viz. vrem.*, XXI (1962), 29–50; "Žitie Leontija Rostovskogo i vizantijskorusskie otnošenija vtoroj poloviny XII v.," *Viz. vrem.*, XXIII (1963), 23–46; "Skazanie o pobede nad Bolgarami 1164 g. i prazdnike Spasa," *Problemy obščestvenno-političeskoj istorii Rossii i slavjanskix stran* (M., 1963), 88–92; and "Iz istorii russko-vizantijskoj cerkovnoj bor'by XII v.," *Viz. vrem.*, XXVI (1965), 190–218.
14. W. Vodoff, "Un 'parti théocratique' dans la Russie du XII^e siècle?," *Cahiers de civilization medi*évale XVII, no. 3 (1974), 193–215.
15. On the first Bishop of Rostov, Leontius, see chapter VII and *Paterik*, 102. The first Bishop of Rostov mentioned in the *Primary Chronicle* was Isaiah

(P.S.R.L. I, col. 199); cf. *Paterik*, 45, 126. On the early history of the Rostov Bishopric see Andrzej Poppe, *Panstwo i kosciol na Rusi w XI wieku* (Warsaw, 1968), 179–83, and "L'organisation diocésaine de la Russie aux XI^e–XII^e s.," *Byzantion* XL, 1970, 193–97.

16. P.S.R.L. I, col. 348.
17. P.S.R.L. II, col. 491.
18. P.S.R.L. I, col. 347.
19. *Ibid.*
20. Voronin, "Andrej Bogoljubskij i Luka Xrizoverg," 33.
21. P.S.R.L. I, col. 352.
22. P.S.R.L. IX, 207.
23. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 350–51; P.S.R.L. II, col. 511.
24. "Pamjatniki drevne-russkoj pis'mennosti: Žitie Svjatogo Leontija, Episkopa Rostovskogo," *Pravoslavnyj sobesednik* (Kazanskaja Duxovnaja Akademija, 1858), part 1, 303. See chapter VI and appendix V.
25. *Zodčestvo*, 188.
26. Sokolov, *Russkij arxierej*, 112–16; Makarij, *Istorija*, III, 105–11.
27. P.S.R.L. I, col. 348; P.S.R.L. II, col. 491.
28. *Ibid.*, col. 493; P.S.R.L. I, col. 349: "vygnaša Rostovcy i Suzdal'ci Leona episkopa zane umnožil cerkov grabja popy." Sokolov interprets this passage thus: "Obložil popov tjažkimi poborami na postrojku novyx cerkvej." (*Russkij arxierej*, 96).
29. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 351–52. On Fedor, see Chapter II, 29ff.
30. P.S.R.L. II, coll. 520–21.
31. Voronin suggests the reconciliation of the two accounts described here ("Iz istorii," 35ff.).
32. See chapter I, 16ff.
33. Cinnamus, 235: ἐπέσταλτο γὰρ αὐτῳ καὶ Ῥωσισθλάβῳ τῷ καὶ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ Ταυροσκυθικῆς ἄρχοντι περὶ συμμαχίας διειλέχθαι. καὶ μέντοι καὶ τετύχηκε τοῦ κατὰ σκοπόν. ὑπερφυῶς γὰρ ἡσθέντες ὅτι δὴ τηλικούτῳ ἐς αὐτοὺς ὅ βυσιλεὺς ἐχρήσατο πρεσβευτῇ, ὑπέσχοντο ἐπιτελῆ πάντα ποιήσειν ὅσα τῷ βασιλεῖ βουλομένῳ ἦσαν. On Russo-Byzantine relations in the twelfth century see F. Chalandon, *Les Comnènes: Etudes sur l'empire byzantine au XI et au XII siècles* (2 vols.; Paris, 1900–1912); E. Frances, "Les relations russo-byzantines au XII siècle et la domination de Galicia au Bas-Danube," *Byzantinoslavica* XX, no. 1 (1959), 50–62; K. Grot, *Iz istorii Ugrii i slavjanstva v XII veke* (Warsaw, 1889); M. V. Levčenko, *Očerki po istorii russko-vizantijskix otnošenii* (M., 1956); G. G. Litavrin, A. P. Każdan, Z. V. Udalcova, "Otnošenija Drevnej Rusi i Vizantii v XI-pervoj polovine XIII v.," *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (1967), 69–92; V. Mošin, "Russkie na Afone i russko-vizantijskie otnošenija v XI–XII vv.," *Byzantinoslavica* XI (1950), 32–60; Priselkov, *Očerki*, 368–405; I. Ševčenko, "Russo-Byzantine Relations After the Eleventh Century," *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (1967), 93–104; G. Vernadsky, "Relations byzantino-russes au XII^e siècle," *Byzantion* IV (1929), 269–75.
34. See especially chapter V.
35. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 352–53.

36. See appendix II and chapter V.

37. Jurij's marriage to a Byzantine woman is usually inferred from his wife's exile to Constantinople during Andrej's reign in Vladimir and from the Greek name — Helena — of his daughter. The marriage probably took place before 1150, if indeed it took place at all. Jurij was married first to a Cuman princess, the daughter of Aepa II, who bore Andrej, Jurij's second son. This marriage occurred in 1108. See N. de Baumgarten, "Généalogies," 27–9, and N. M. Karamzin, *Istorija gosudarstva rossijskogo,* II (6th ed., St. Petersburg, 1851), 235, n. 405.

38. Cinnamus, 236–37: κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον καὶ Βλαδίσθλαβος, εἷς ὢν τῶν ἐν Ταυροσκυθικῇ δυναστῶν, σὺν παισί τε καὶ γυναικὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει τε τῇ πάσῃ αὐτόμολος ἐς Ῥωμαίους ἦλθε, χώρα τε αὐτῷ παρὰ τὸν Ἴστρον δεδώρηται, ἣν δὴ καὶ Βασιλίκᾳ πρότερον τῷ Γεωργίου παιδί, ὃς τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῶν ἐν Ταυροσκυθικῇ φυλάρχων εἶχε. . . .

39. On Fedor's identity, see also the *Nikon Chronicle* (P.S.R.L. IX, 239). The same source, in its citation of a letter from Patriarch Luke to Prince Andrej, states that Fedor was the son of the sister of Manuel of Smolensk (225). The latter identification is dubious, for Fedor knew no Greek and it is highly unlikely that Manuel, a Greek, would have been the uncle of Andrej's candidate for Metropolitan of Vladimir. See Sokolov, *Russkij arxierej,* 145–47, who suggests that Fedor was a married priest since he appears to have criticized those who defended a chaste clergy and possibly angered his ecclesiastical constituency by refusing to separate from his wife. B. A. Rybakov favors the first identification ("Bojarin-letopisec XII veka," *Istorija SSSR* V, [1959], 56–79). See also Vodoff, "Un parti theocratique . . . ,"95.

40. The sixteenth century Russian translation of this letter is quoted in Makarij, *Istorija,* III, appendix 2, 298–300. See appendix I of this essay. See also *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka,* VI (2nd ed.; M., 1908), coll. 65–76.

41. P.S.R.L. IX, 223–29. For reconstruction of the last part of this letter, see Sokolov, *Russkij arxierej,* 143. Luke's letter is not dated. Voronin suggests 1168 ("Andrej Bogoljubskij i Luka Xrizoverg," 33). Most historians suggest its arrival between 1165 and 1168, but Sokolov pushes the date forward to 1169 on the basis of the following conjectures: (1) Leon's absence from the official condemnation of Polikarp by Metropolitan Constantine in late 1168; (2) Leon's possible presence at the Council of Constantinople of late 1168 concerned with the aforementioned dietary issue; (3) Leon's appeal to Luke and Luke's recognition of the necessity to vindicate Leon once again because the Council of Constantinople had waived abstention from meat on Christmas should it occur on Wednesday or Friday (13036). This is a highly imaginative hypothesis, but essentially unfounded. All that can be ascertained from the evidence at hand is that Luke wrote to Andrej after Leon's departure from Suzdal' for Kiev and Constantinople sometime in 1165 or shortly after. For analysis of the relationship between Prince and Bishop suggested in this letter, see V. Val'denberg, *Dreverusskie učenija o predelax carskoj vlasti* (Petrograd, 1916), 118.

42. See appendix I.

43. *Ibid.*

44. *Ibid.*

45. *Ibid.*

46. C. Hefele and H. Leclerq, *A History of the Christian Councils,* trans. from

the German by Wm. Clarke (Edin. 1872), III, 398: Canon 12: "It has become known to us that some, in opposition to the ordinances of the Church, have had recourse to the rulers and have by imperial edicts divided ecclesiastical sees in two so that by that means there are two metropolitans in one province. The holy synod, therefore, decrees that for the future no bishop shall venture to do so, since he who ventures upon it shall lose his office."

47. See appendix I.

48. *Ibid.*

49. *Ibid.* The Council mentioned in this passage was probably the Council of Constantinople, 1168. See note 41 of this chapter.

50. *Ibid.*

51. The first definite seal with this reading is assigned by I. Ševčenko to Constantine II ("Russo-Byzantine Relations," 96).

52. P.S.R.L. IX, 223–29.

53. *Ibid.*, 226.

54. *Ibid.*, 227–29.

55. P.S.R.L. I, col. 355. Voronin suspects that the title "*vladyka*" associated with Fedor represents the chronicler's confusion of Andrej's protégé with the Metropolitan Fedor, who came to *Rus'* in 1165 (P.S.R.L. II, col. 522). See "Andrej Bogoljubskij i Luka Xrizoverg," 32. It is also possible that the title "vladyka" reflects Fedor's unofficial overlordship of the Church of Vladimir.

56. The *Nikon Chronicle* (P.S.R.L. IX, 239) claims that Fedor was appointed Bishop of Rostov by the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1170. Golubinskij doubts the authenticity of this passage and conjectures that Andrej sent Fedor to Constantinople to continue negotiations for the establishment of a direct relationship of his Bishopric with Constantinople. Since his first request for a Metropolitanate was turned down, he argues, Andrej probably suggested the establishment of an autocephalous Bishopric of Rostov (*Istorija russkoj cerkvi* I, part 1, 439–44). Given Patriarch Luke's admonition to Andrej that he ignore the advice of Fedor, it seems rather unlikely that Andrej would have sent him on a mission to the Patriarch. It is more probable that Fedor's alleged voyage to Byzantium was a fabrication of a later chronicler.

57. P.S.R.L. I, col. 355.

58. *Ibid.*, coll. 355–56.

59. *Ibid.*, col. 357.

60. *Ibid.*, col. 356; cf. P.S.R.L. II, col. 552, where the murder is said to have been committed on Dog's ("Pesij") Island.

61. Voronin, "Andrej Bogoljubskij i Luka Xrizoverg," 44.

62. Cited in Golubinskij, *Istorija* I, part 1, 805, n. 1.

63. Cited in *ibid.*, 442, n. 1.

64. Cited in A. I. Ponomarev, *Pamjatniki drevne-russkoj cerkovno-učitel'noj literatury* I (M., 1894), 197–98. I. P. Eremin, "Pritča o slepce i xromce v drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti," *Izvestija Otdelenija Russkogo Jazyka i Slovestnosti A.N.-S.S.S.R.* XXX (1925), 323–52; Voronin, "Andrej Bogoljubskij i Luka Xrizoverg," 39; and G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind* (Cambridge, 1946), 69, all assume the connection between Cyril's sermon and Andrej and Fedor.

65. Ponomarev, *Pamjatniki*, 198.

66. P.S.R.L. I, col. 329.

67. See chapter II, 31.

68. P.S.R.L. I, col. 391. Laurent (*Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin* V, part 1 [Paris, 1963], 606: no. 790, 609) refers to a seal with the inscription on the reverse "Moses Metropolitan of Vladimir." The seal is no. 302 of the Mabbott collection of the American Numismatic Society. Laurent suggests that the seal might prove that Andrej totally disregarded Luke's letter. But Laurent's reading and twelfth century dating of the seal are entirely conjectural. Of the word which he takes to be Vladimir only five letters remain, according to Laurent Βλαδη. I. Ševčenko suggests the alternate reading (καταν(ης) and assigns the seal to eleventh century Sicily ("Russo-Byzantine Relations"). In response to Ševčenko's counter-suggestion Laurent reaffirmed his own reading with the possible, but insignificant variations ΡΛΑΔΜ (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift* LX, no. 2 [1967], 412). A knowledge of the history of Bogoljubskij's reign leads to considerable suspicion of Laurent's reading. Surely Russian chronicles would have testified to this Moses of Vladimir had he existed during or after Andrej's reign or to any other metropolitan of Vladimir during this general period. See also V. L. Janin, *Aktovye pečati drevnej Rusi*, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1970), 59.

CHAPTER III

1. For discussions of the identification of the 1177 *svod* see A. A. Šaxmatov, *Obozrenie russkix letopisnyx svodov XIV–XVI vv.* (M., L., 1939), 44–68; E. Ju. Perfeckij, *Russkie letopisnye svody i ix vzaimootnošenija* (*Trudy filosofskogo fakulteta universiteta Komenskogo*, no. 1, Bratislava, 1922), 29–31; M. D. Priselkov, *Istorija russkogo letopisanija* (L., 1940), 57–58; D. S. Lixačev, *Russkie letopisi i ix kul'turno-istoričeskoe značenie* (M., L., 1947), 268–80; A. N. Nasonov, "Maloissledovannye voprosy Rostovo-Suzdal'skogo letopisanija XII veka," *Problemy istočnikovedenija* IX (M., 1961), 349–92; Ju. A. Limonov, *Letopisanie Rostovo-Suzdal'skoj Rusi* (L., 1967). See also my article, "Andrei Bogoliubskii: An Image of the Prince," *Russian History* II, 1 (1975), 39–52.

2. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 323–74.

3. P.S.R.L. II, coll. 580–95.

4. Nasonov, "Maloissledovannye voprosy," 366, and *Istorija russkogo letopisanija XI–nachala XVIII v. Očerki i issledovanija* (M., 1969), 133ff. Nasonov adds that the manner of these articles differs significantly from that of the chronicling of Prince Andrej's reign in Vladimir and resembles more the personal portraits of more southernly princes. I wonder: the *Tale of the Miracles* . . . (see Chapter IV) certainly reveals a personal manner quite reminiscent of those 1149–52 chronicle passages.

5. Šaxmatov, *Obozrenie*, 74; Priselkov, *Istorija*, 71; Limonov, *Letopisanie*, 62–68. Limonov credits Andrej with the authorship of these passages on the basis of their condescending tone toward Andrej's brothers, their detailed accounting of the battles, their favoritism toward Andrej, and finally, on Voronin's evidence that Andrej wrote some of the other ideological treatises associated with his reign. Although conceivable, Limonov's conjectures cannot be proved.

6. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 323–24.
7. *Ibid.*, col. 324.
8. The *Nikon Chronicle* (P.S.R.L. IX, coll. 181–82) contains a more elaborate description of the burial, echoed in some illustrations in the *Licevoj svod.* Voronin suspects that these references to the placing of a *srub'* in the ground are remnants of a no longer extant prototype from which the *Hypatian* and *Laurentian* accounts of the Lutsk episode were derived. See "Pogrebenie konja v srube v 1149 g.," *Kratkie soobščenija* 125 (1971), 23–6. Izjaslav Jaroslavič was a prince when his shoulder was struck with a spear. P.S.R.L. I, col. 201, s.a. 1078.
9. *Ibid.*, coll. 325–26.
10. *Ibid.*, col. 241. Translated in Cross, 206. See also N. N. Voronin, "O vremeni i meste vključenija v letopisi sočinenij Vladimira Monomaxa," *Istoriko-arxeologičeskij sbornik* (M., 1962), 265–71.
11. P.S.R.L. I, col. 251.
12. *Ibid.*, translated in Cross, 215.
13. P.S.R.L. I, col. 251.
14. *Ibid.*, col. 329.
15. *Ibid.*, coll. 332–33.
16. *Ibid.*, coll. 333–34.
17. *Ibid.*, col. 335.
18. I. U. Budovnic, *Obščestvenno-političeskaja mysl' drevnej Rusi* (M., 1960), 232–49, and Lixačev, *Russkie letopisi,* 268–81 discuss briefly the ideology implicit in the chronicling of Andrej's reign.
19. P.S.R.L. II, col. 482.
20. P.S.R.L. I, col. 346.
21. For a more elaborate accounting of the miraculous journey, see chapter IV and "Skazanie o čudesax."
22. Lixačev views the account of the reign as a chain-like enumeration of the miracles which the Virgin wrought in Andrej's behalf, *Russkie letopisi,* 278.
23. P.S.R.L. I, col. 348.
24. *Ibid.*, col. 351.
25. Andrej is never called Bogoljubskij in the earliest chronicles. The above passage contains the only closely related epithet, *bogoljubivym'.*
26. For a discussion of the artists involved in Andrej Bogoljubskij's church building, see *Zodčestvo,* 329–42.
27. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 351–52. See chapter II, 27.
28. *Ibid.*, 26.
29. *Ibid.*, 33.
30. P.S.R.L. I, col. 357. "Carskoju" could, of course, be a fourteenth-century embellishment.
31. *Ibid.*, coll. 352–53.
32. In another work of the period, *The Bulgar Tale* (*Skazanie o pobede nad Bolgarami*), the defeat of the Volga Bulgars assumes an added dimension. The battle is said to coincide with the victory of Tsar Manuel Comnenus over the Saracens. According to this *Tale* Andrej and Manuel resolve jointly to establish a holiday commemorating their coincident victories. The chronicle account makes no such pretentious comparison. See Chapter V and I. E. Zabelin, "Sledy literatur-

nogo truda Andreja Bogoljubskogo," *Arxeologičeskie investija i zametki* II (1895), 41 ff.

33. P.S.R.L. I, col. 354.

34. *Ibid.*

35. *Ibid.*, col. 357. Ščapov suggests that Bogoljubskij may even have been responsible for the first redaction of the church "*ustav*" of Vladimir (*Knjažeskie ustavy* . . . , 130–35).

36. *Ibid.*, col. 362. For other interpretations of the Virgin's intervention in behalf of the Novgorodians according to medieval Russian chronicles see A. Frolow, "Le *Znamenie* de Novgorod: évolution de la légende," *Revue des études slaves* XXIV (1948), 67–81, and "Le *Znamenie* de Novgorod: les origines de la légende," *Revue des études slaves* XXV (1949), 45–72.

37. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 367–71; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 580–95.

38. Šaxmatov, *Obozrenie*, 76; Perfeckij, *Russkie letopisnye svody*, 47–50; V. P. Adrianova-Perec, "O realističeskix tendenciax v drevne-russkoj literature," T.O. D.R.L., XVI, 15–17.

39. N. N. Voronin, "Povest' ob ubijstve Andreja Bogoljubskogo i ee avtor," *Istorija SSSR* (1963), no. 3, 80–97.

40. Limonov, *Letopisanie*, 78–86. See also A. N. Nasonov, *Istorija* . . . , 150, who supports this view.

41. Most historians credit Kuzmišče alone with the authorship of the murder tales. Voronin is inclined to attribute the largest share of the responsibility for what he regards as a joint project to Mikula the Priest (Voronin, "Povest' ob ubijstve," 97).

42. See "Skazanie o čudesax," 36, 39.

43. P.S.R.L. II, col. 580; P.S.R.L. I, col. 367.

44. P.S.R.L. II, col. 580.

45. *Ibid.*, col. 582. On architectural parallels between Vladimir and Kiev, see *Zodčestvo*, 316.

46. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 125, 126, translated in Cross, 121–22.

47. P.S.R.L. II, col. 584; P.S.R.L. I, col. 368.

48. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 152–53, translated in Cross, 137–38.

49. P.S.R.L. II, coll. 580–82.

50. *Ibid.*, col. 582; see also P.S.R.L. I, col. 367. Hagia Sophia in Constantinople has often been compared to the Temple of Solomon. According to the sixth-century Byzantine writer, Paul the Silentiary, the Emperor Justinian entered the church upon its completion and proclaimed: "Solomon, I have outdone thee." Translation in W. R. Lethaby and H. Swainson, *The Church of Sancta Sophia Constantinople* (London, 1894), 141. For other such comparisons with the Temple of Solomon, see Lethaby, 100–05, 144–45.

51. V. M. Istrin, *Xronika Georgija Amartola v drevnem slavjano-russkom perevode* (St. Petersburg, 1920), 139–45. The following passages could have influenced Bogoljubskij's chronicler: "pozlati vyspr'njaja steny vsja i pomost' s'tvoriv paky ot Sufira pozlati dom . . . i steny i verxi i dv'ri i odver'ja." And, at the Ark of the Covenant "dveri emu i zlatom' pokova." And "jako mramory krasnymi i različnymi cerkvy ukrašena . . . i kamen'ja ispolnena, dragoe kamenie i različnoe, i vsjakogo kamenija čestnogo premnogo." See N. N. Voronin, "Literaturnye istočniki v

tvorčestve drevnerusskix zodčix," T.O.D.R.L., XIII (1957), 364–74.

52. Alexander the Great, a hero of the *Primary Chronicle*, was also one of Bogoljubskij's heroes. Several sculptures of the Uspenskij Sobor in Vladimir depict or suggest him (*Zodčestvo*, 174). David is also depicted in Bogoljubskij architecture: the Church of the Pokrov (na-Nerli) has on its north facade a stone carving of David with harp in hand. For the most recent discussion of this carving, see V. K. Vagner, *Skul'ptura drevnej Rusi XII v.: Vladimir, Bogoljubovo* (M., 1969), 136–37.

53. P.S.R.L. II, col. 584; P.S.R.L. I, col. 361.

54. P.S.R.L. II, col. 594; P.S.R.L. I, col. 371.

55. P.S.R.L. II, col. 587; P.S.R.L. I, col. 369.

56. P.S.R.L. II, col. 587; P.S.R.L. I, col. 369.

57. P.S.R.L. II, col. 585.

58. *Ibid.* Andrej's father Jurij also revered the tradition of Boris and Gleb and built a Church in their name on the Nerl River (P.S.R.L. I, col. 349). For discussion of the holy princes of Kiev, see M. Cherniavski, *Tsar and People* (New Haven, 1961), 5–43, and G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind*, I: *Kievan Christianity* (New York, 1960, 2nd ed.), 94–131.

59. P.S.R.L. II, col. 588. The attribution to the "holy orthodox tsars" of shedding blood in imitation of Christ had no Byzantine antecedent and was probably the chronicler's projection of his own political views onto Byzantium.

60. *Ibid.*, col. 350. See Lixačev, *Russkie letopisi*, 218–26.

61. P.S.R.L. II, col. 592; P.S.R.L. I, col. 368. Biblical citations from *Holy Bible: Revised Standard Edition* (New York, 1953).

62. On the history of Agapetus in medieval Russia see I. Ševčenko, "A Neglected Byzantine Source of Muscovite Ideology," *Harvard Slavic Studies* II (Cambridge, 1954), 140–79; and "On Some Sources of Prince Svjatoslav's *Izbornik* of the Year 1076," *Orbis Scriptus, Festschrift für Dmitrij Tschizewskij zum 70 Geburtstag* (Munich, 1966), 723–38.

63. P.S.R.L. II, col. 593; P.S.R.L. I, col. 370.

CHAPTER IV

1. P.S.R.L. I, col. 346.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.* The chronicler adds that "the Icon of the Holy Virgin had come from Tsargrad on the same ship as the Pirogošča Icon." (P.S.R.L. I, col. 346) Since a church dedicated to the Pirogošča icon was built in Kiev during the reign of Monomax's son, Mstislav, in 1132 (P.S.R.L. I, col. 301; P.S.R.L. II, coll. 294, 300), it is likely that both the Pirogošča and the Vladimir Virgin icons arrived from Constantinople several decades before the latter fell into Bogoljubskij's hands.

4. "Skazanie o čudesax."

5. This is the MS used by Ključevskij. The *Skazanie* is also interpolated into the *Stepennaja kniga* (P.S.R.L. XXI, coll. 424–40).

6. "Skazanie o čudesax," "Introduction," 10–14.

7. Voronin, "Iz istorii," 198.

8. Limonov, *Letopisanie*, 75. Limonov identifies the child of Andrej mentioned in the "Skazanie" as Jurij, who in his estimation was born in the late sixties. See note 23 of this chapter.

9. "Skazanie o čudesax," "Introduction," 12.

10. I. E. Zabelin, "Sledy literaturnogo truda Andreja Bogoljubskogo," *Arxeologičeskie izvestija i zametki* II–III (1895), 45.

11. Voronin, "Iz istorii," 208.

12. "Skazanie o čudesax," 29: Jako bo solnce sotvori Bog', ne na edinom' meste postavi. egda svetit obxodja vsju vselennuju. lučami osveščaet'. takože i sij obraz prečistyja vladičica našeja Bogorodica i presnodevy Marija. ne na edinom' meste čjudesa i dary iscelenija istočaet'. no obxodjašče vsja strany i mira prosveščaet i ot nedug' različnyx' izbavljaet.

13. P.S.R.L. II, col. 594.

14. Gosudarstvennyj istoričeskij Muzej, otd. III, no. 431, fol. 127r: Pače slnčnyx' luč' tvoim svetjaščim'sja omoforom' osveščaeši crkv' i ljudi. See chapter VII.

15. "Skazanie o čudesax," 29–31: Knjazju že Andreju xotjašču knjažiti na Rostovskuju zemlju. i nača besedovati ob ikonax' povedaša emu ikonu v Vyšegorode v žen'skom' monastyri, presvjatyja vladičicy našeja Bogorodicy. jako triždy sstupila s mesta. pervoe vnidoša v cerkov' i videša ju sredi cerkvi osob' stojašču. i postaviša ju na inom' meste. vtoroe videvše ju ko oltarevi licem' obrativšusja. i rkoša jako bo oltarevi xoščet stojati. i postaviša ju za trapezoju. tretie videša ju krome trapezy o sebe stojašču i inyx čjudes' množestvo. Se slyšav' knjaz' rad byst', i priide v cerkv'. i načat smotriti po ikonam. sija že ikona jako prešla be vsex' obrazov'. videv' ju i pripade na zemli moljasja glagolja. O presvjataja Bogorodice materi Xrista Boga našegošče xoščesi mi zastupnica byti na Rostovskuju zemlju. posetiti novoprosvjaščenyja ljudi. da po tvoej voli vsja si budut. i togda vzem ikonu poexa na Rostovskuju zemlju. poim kliros s soboju.

16. See chapter VI, 74 and appendix IV.

17. See chapter VII.

18. "Skazanie o čudesax," 31: edušču že emu putem' poja s soboju provodnika. i priexa k rece Vozuze. i videv ju navodnivšusja nuždeju. posla čeloveka v reku pytati brodu. i jako vnide v reku na koni i pogrjaze vo dno. knjaz' že načat molitisja ko ikone presvjatyja vladičica našeja Bogorodica i prisnodevica Marija. jako povinen' esm' smerti ego gospože, ašče ne ty izbaviši. i se byst' namnogo moljaščusja emu. i abie izyde sredi reki čelovek' on' na koni i batog' v ruce. i priexa na breg' knjaz' že rad byv. i odariv' i otpusti vo svoja si. (The Vozuza River is 200 versts from the northernmost point of the Dnieper River.)

19. *Ibid.*, 33: i priexa v Volodimer blagorodnyj knjaz' Andrej i sozda crkv' v imja presvjatyja Bogorodica. ukrasiv' ju vsjakim' blagočestiem. i postaviša v nej čjudotvornuju ikonu presvjatej vladičicy našej Bogorodicy.

20. "Skazanie o čudesax," 35–36.

21. P.S.R.L. I, col. 368.

22. *Ibid.*, 36: Po nekolicex že vremenex prišešu prazdniku gospožinu dni. knjaz' že Andrej na kanone stojašče vo cerkvi, penija liki sotvorjaja, a srdcem boljaše. be bo knjagini ego boljaše detinoju bolezniju. dva dni naprasno boljašči. jako po

kanone byst' omyvše vodoju ikonu presvjatyja Bogorodica, posla ko knjagine. ona že vkusi vody toja, i rodi detja zdravo, i sama by zdrava tom čase molitvami svjatyja Bogorodicy;

23. Limonov identifies the child of Andrej mentioned in the "Skazanie" as Jurij, who in his estimation was born in the late sixties. (*Letopisanie*, 75)

24. "Skazanie o čudesax," 42–43: Knjaz' blagorodnyj Andrej, sozda zlatyja vrata k prazdniku svjatyja Bogorodica. glagolja k boljarom'. egda snidutsja ljude na prazdnik i vrata uzrjat. byvšu že prazdniku. i snidesja narod ko vratom'. be bo ešče ne suxa izvest' vo vratex. abie že vnezaapu istergšisja ot sten' vrata i padoša na ljudi. i pokryša. vi. muža. se že slyšav' knjaz' Andrej načat so vozdyxaniem molitisja ko ikone presvjatej Bogorodicy. Gospože prečistaja vladičice. ašče six ty ne izbaviši. az bo grešnyj povinen' byx smerti six. i posla boljarina svoego dati vse na potrebu mertvym. on že priexav i vzjaša vrata, i videša vsex' suščix pod vraty živyx i zdravyx. i se slyšav knjaz' Andrej rad byst. i se čjudo vidjašče narodi čjudišasju.

25. P.S.R.L. IX, col. 204; P.S.R.L. XXI, coll. 192–93, 230. See David B. Miller, "Legends of the Icon of Our Lady of Vladimir: A Study of the Development of Muscovite National Consciousness," *Speculum* XLIII (1968), 657–70.

26. V. N. Lazarev, "Živopis' Vladimiro-Suzdal'skoj Rusi," *Istorija russkogo iskusstva* I (M., 1953), 442–44. The Icon is of the Hodgetria type. See N. Kondakov, *Ikonografija Bogomateri* II (St. Petersburg, 1914), 201 and A. I. Anisimov, *Vladimirskaja ikona Božiej Materi* (Prague, 1928).

CHAPTER V

1. Zabelin, "Sledy," 45–46 (from a sixteenth century *prolog*, Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Muzej, sobr. I. E. Zabelina, no. 369, fols. 142–44); "Skazanie o čudesax," 21–28 (from *Sbornik* of the Synodal'naja Biblioteka, no. 556, fols. 426–29). For Zabelin version, see appendix II.

2. Gosudarstvennaja Biblioteka Lenina, fond 304, no. 23, fol. 47. Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Muzej, sobranie rukopisej Arxangel'skogo Sobora no. 1/1019, fol. 255v. See Sergij, *Polnyj mesjaceslov Vostoka* II (M., 1876), part 2, "Zametki," 223–25.

3. See chapter VI.

4. See chapter IV, 58.

5. P.S.R.L. XXI, 440.

6. *Minei svjašč. Miljutina*, foll. 14–15. See "Skazanie o čudesax," 14–15.

7. Zabelin, "Sledy," 44.

8. "Skazanie o čudesax," 15–16. N. N. Voronin, "Skazanie o pobede nad Bolgarami i Prazdnike Spasa," *Problemy obščestvenno-političeskoj istorii Rossii i slavjanskix stran* (M., 1963), 88–93.

9. Voronin, "Iz istorii," 202.

10. See appendix II.

11. Voronin, "Skazanie," 90; see also Budovnic, *Mysl'*, 243.

12. B. A. Rybakov, "Zapis' o smerti Jaroslava Mudrogo," *Sovetskaja arxeologija* IV (1959), 245. Rybakov alludes to a *nadpis'* of Saint Sophia in Kiev which includes the words "*naš' car*," without reference to the ruler in question. Rybakov

concludes that the inscription refers to Jaroslav primarily as a result of a misreading of Priselkov's *Istorija russkogo letopisanija*, according to which imperial power was established in Russia after 1037 (p. 81). Rybakov takes Priselkov's obvious reference to Theopemptos, the first Greek metropolitan of Kiev cited in the *Primary Chronicle*, as an indication that the Russian prince became a tsar.

13. P.S.R.L. II, col. 380.

14. P.S.R.L. I, col. 357.

15. See chapter III, 52.

16. See appendix II.

17. For a discussion of the title "Metropolitan of all Russia," see chapter II, 000.

18. Constantine I died in 1159 and Constantine II did not arrive in Kiev until 1168. Most likely the reference is to the second Constantine with whom Andrej is not known to have communicated.

19. P.S.R.L. I, col. 347.

20. See chapter VI.

21. P.S.R.L. I, col. 352. This occurs in the same entry as an account of the attack on the Bulgars in 1164.

22. See appendix II.

23. On the influence of the mystique of Manuel Comnenus on old Russian literature see A. Sedel'nikov, "Epičeskaja tradicija o Manuile Komnine," *Slavia* III, no. 4 (1925), 606–18. Voronin conjectures that the allusion to Manuel's fear of Monomax in the "Slovo o pogibeli russkoj zemli" is derived from the *Bulgar Narration*. ("Skazanie," 91). See Ju. K. Begunov, *Pamjatnik russkoj literatury XIII v.* (M., L., 1965), 184: I kjur' Manuil' cesaregorodskyj, opas' imeja, pone i velikyja dary posylaše k nemu, aby pod' nim' velikyj knjaz' Volodimer' Cesarjagoroda ne vzjal'.

24. See chapters VI and VII.

25. Voronin, "Skazanie," 92. The *Jaroslavskij spisok* of the *Bulgar Narration* includes a section of the "Tale of Carevič Peter of the Horde," a fourteenth century Rostov creation.

26. See appendix II.

27. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 352–53.

28. See chapter VI.

29. See chapter VII.

30. See chapter VI.

31. Voronin, for example, suggests that the shared experience implied competition with Byzantium ("Skazanie," 90). I think, rather, that we are in the realm of ideological play where the boundaries between mimesis and competition are difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish.

32. See appendix II.

33. P.S.R.L. I, col. 124.

34. "Služba," 127r and 128v.

35. *Ibid.*, 128v.

36. *Ibid.*, 128v.

37. See appendix II.

38. "Skazanie o čudesax," 26: I mne grešnomu. dai Gospodi preže konca pokaanie zane sogrešix pače Sodoma i Gomora. prognevax tvoe čelovekoljubie. i

otgnax ot sebe angela xranitelja moego. Cf. Ševčenko, "Russo-Byzantine Relations After the Eleventh Century," 95.

39. The work is entitled "Slovo velikogo knjazja Andreja Bogoljubskogo o milosti božii" (Voronin, "Skazanie," 92).

40. *Ibid.*

41. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 252–56.

42. "Služba," 128v.

43. N. N. Voronin, *Arxeologičeskie zametki,* KSIIMK (1956), 19–22. Voronin interprets the plate thus:

[greš] nomu
[rab] ou tvo
emu A
n'dre [ju].

44. Vladimir Svjatoslavič, for example, calls himself "nedostoinyj rab' tvoj" (P.S.R.L. I, col. 124).

CHAPTER VI

1. Makarij, *Velikie minei čet'i,* Oktjabr' (St. Petersburg, 1870), coll. 4–5 and appendix iv.

2. The manuscript of the *Služba* is contained in the *Pergamennaja Psaltyr'* (c. 1340), *Synodal'naja Biblioteka, Otdel rukopisej gosudarstvennogo istoričeskogo muzeja, otd. III,* no. 431, fol. 126v–128v. The *Služba* has been published in corrupt form in many Russian menologies such that its original political message is heavily disguised and distorted. For a list of the printed *Služby* see E. Golubinskij, *Istorija russkoj cerkvi,* II (M., 1894), part I, 439. Several additional *pokrov* writings are incorporated into Makarij's *Velikie minei čet'i*: the *Slovo na pokrov* of unknown authorship and the *Slovo na pokrov* of Paxomij the Serb. The latter is a fifteenth century piece; the former's dating is unclear: Sergij, Archbishop of Vladimir, contended that both the *Služba* and this *Slovo* (coll. 6–17; Paxomij's *Slovo* immediately follows this, coll. 17–23) were penned by the same author in the pre-Mongol period, conceivably by someone in the Bogoljubskij circle (Sergij, "Sv. Andrej, Xrista radi Jurodivyj," *Strannik,* III (1898), 393–425; 605–50). E. S. Medvedev, on the other hand, argued for a fourteenth century dating on thematic and stylistic grounds: the emphasis of this *Slovo* shifts from the political themes of the *Služba* and *Proložnoe skazanie* to moral and ethical concerns and the language is not characteristically Kievan, but closer to that of Paxomij's *Slovo* (*Drevnerusskaja ikonografija Pokrova, Dissertacia na učenuju stepen' kandidata iskusstvovedenija. Arxiv Arxeologii A.N.S.S.S.R.* R-2 #1728, 160–68). Voronin ("Iz istorii," 211) argues that the truth lies somewhere in between. The *Slovo* dates to the fourteenth century in its extant form but contains fragments of an earlier *Slovo* which might be assigned to Bogoljubskij's reign. I would question Voronin's assertion and lament his tendency to exaggerate the zeal of Andrej's court writers.

3. *Velikie minei čet'i.* Oktjabr', col. 19: po neže i sie božestvennoe čudo i Pokrov' Prečistyja Bogorodicy ne utaisja no pače vsem' javleno byst' dažd' do samogo Patriarxa i carja: tem že prečistyj mnogosvetlyj prazdnik Pokrova Pre-

čistyja sostavl'še ustaviša prazdnovati mesjaca oktjabrja v' pervyj den'.

4. Sergij, "Sv. Andrej," 393–425. Golubinskij tentatively attributed the holiday to the Russians; he ascribed it to the post-Mongol period. He thought it was a private celebration emanating from an unspecified monastery (*Istorija*, I, part 2 [M., 1894], 400–06).

5. Sergij, "Sv. Andrej," 404.

6. M. A. Ostroumov, "Prazdnik Pokrova Presvjatyja Bogorodicy," *Prixodskoe čtenie* (Oct. 29, 1911), 401–12.

7. See Voronin, "Iz istorii," 210ff.

8. L. Müller, *Des Metropoliten Ilarion*, 23–27, 31. See also my article, "The Sermon on Law and Grace: History as Progress in Kiev Rus'," *Russian History* (Winter, 1980).

9. *Ibid.*, 123–24.

10. Cross, 291 (P.S.R.L. I, col. 255).

11. On the Virgin's robe see N. P. Kondakov, *Ikonografija Bogomateri*, I (St. Petersburg, 1914), 347 and N. Baynes, "The Finding of the Virgin's Robe," *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), 240–47. For Byzantine sources on the translation of the vestment see Ioannes B. Papadopoulos, *Les Palais et les Eglises des Blachernes* (1928), 22–24, and R. Janin, *Les Eglises et les Monastères de Constantinople* (Paris, 1953), 169.

12. Translated in A. A. Vasiliev, *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860* (Cambridge, Mass., 1946), 220 from C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* V, part 1 (Paris, 1870), Homily Two, 167–73. A further source of some relevance is the Akathistos Hymn to the Virgin who is glorified for saving Constantinople from the siege of an unspecified enemy. Vasiliev (97, 216), conjectures that the enemy in question was the Russians. Most scholars, however, agree to the 626 origin of the Hymn, when the Avars attacked Constantinople. Other historians attribute the Hymn to the sixth century hymnographer Romanus the Melode: see *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica* (eds. P. Maas and C.A.T. Trypanis, Oxford, 1963), xviii. In any event, the Hymn is one more instance of the Virgin-protectress motif put to political use. For the text see, for example, W. Christ and M. Paranikas, *Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum* (Leipzig, 1871), 140–47. On another sermon associated with the Russian attack of 860 see Xr. Loparev, "Staroe svedetel'stvo o položenii rizy Bogorodicy vo Vlaxernax v' novom' istolkovanii primenitel'no k' našestviju russkix na Vizantiju v 860 godu," *Viz. vrem.* II (1895), 581–628.

13. Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia* (ed. I. Bekker, C.S.H.B., Bonn, 1842), 240–41; Th. Tafel, *Theodosii Meliteni Chronographia, Monumenta Saecularia*, II, part i (Munich, 1859), 168; Symeon Magister, *Chronographia* (ed. I. Bekker, C.S.H.B., Bonn, 1838), 674.

14. Georgii Hamartoli Continuator (ed. V. M. Istrin, 2 vols., L., 1922), 11.

15. Cross, 60.

16. For the Greek text see Migne, P.G. CXI, coll. 848–49. The Russian text is included in the *Velikie minei čet'i*, coll. 207–08. See appendix III. Germaine de Costa Louillet dates this *Vita* to the tenth century ("Saints de Constantinople aux VII^e, IX^e, et X^e siecles," *Byzantion* XXIV [1954], 179–214; J. Wortley ("A Note on the Date of the *Vita Sancti Andreae Sali*," *Byzantion* XXXIX [1969], 204–08),

dates the work to between 910 and 920. The Russian translation first appeared in the twelfth century according to I. I. Sreznevskij, "Žitie Andreja Jurodivogo," *Svedenija i zametki o maloizvestnyx i neizvestnyx pamjatnikax,* no. 87 (St. Petersburg, 1879).

17. See appendix III.

18. *Ibid.*

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.*

21. Voronin, "Iz istorii," 211.

22. *Ibid.*, 212.

23. This and all subsequent quotations from the *Služba na Pokrov* are cited from my own hand-copied text of the MS which I was unable to photograph. See note 2 of this chapter. O velikoe zastuplenie pečal'nym' esi Bogorodice čestnaja skoraja pomošč' spasenie i utverždenie i milosti pučina božestvennyja mudrosti istočnik i mirovi pokrov'. V'spoim' vernyj svetlyj omofor' ee xvaljašče. . . . (fol. 126v.)

24. See above, p. 149 and appendix IV.

25. Divnyj prorok' Isaiija: budet, reče, v poslednjaja dni, jave gora Gospoda i xramy is' naverx' gory; uvedexom', vladičice istin'no, i isbytie gory bo i xolmi ukrasišasja mnogoimenitymi cerkvami. . . . (fol. 126v.)

26. Kiev, of course, was a hilly town and the reference could suggest that the author was describing that city rather than Vladimir.

27. See chapter III.

28. O čjudnoe ukrašenie vsem' vernym' esi proročeskoe istin'noe sbytie apostolom' slava mučenikom'. . . . (fol. 126v.)

30. . . . jako rosa Xristos' Bog' snide i rodi. . . . (fol. 126v.)

31. See, for example, Müller, *Des Metropoliten Ilarion,* 74, in reference to Judges 3, 9 "Let it be dry only on the fleece and on all the ground let there be dew." Hilarion comments "Po vsej bo zemli suša prežde be idol'stej l'sti jazyki odr'žašči i rosy blagodatnyja nepriemljuščim'." On p. 135 Hilarion applies the image to Russia.

32. . . . emu že molisja izbaviti grad' i ljudi slavjaščix tja verno i tvoego pokrova čestnyj prazdnik' čtuščix'. (fol. 126v.)

33. Voronin, "Iz istorii," 218.

34. Pače Aronja kivota . . . i pače slnč'nyx' luč' tvoim' svetjaščisja omforom' osveščaesi cerkov' i ljudi. . . . (fol. 126v.)

35. Pridete vsi konci zemlja čestnyj pokrov' Božija Matere ublažim' . . . (fol. 126v.)

36. Voronin, "Iz istorii," 212–13.

37. . . . vse . . . prosjašči mira mirovi a knjaz'm' deržavy. . . . (fol. 127r.)

38. . . . za ny čtuščaja tja cesarice pomolisja izbaviti ny ot' vsjakogo zla. . . . (fol. 127r.)

39. fol. 127r. (verse iii).

40. Se jako pred kivotom' drevle sobrav' liky David igraet' no paky nyne . . . tekušče tebe klanjajuščesja glagolat' pomolisja za čtuščaja tja i tvoj slavjašče pokrov' čestno prazdnuem'. (fol. 127r.)

41. Pojut' tja Devo Bogorodice angelski lici i slavjat' tja patriarsi s'stavili pred'

licem ti tekušče v crkv'; s nimi že tja togda svjatyj An'drej vide za ny grešnyja k' Bogu moljaščjusja pomilovati ljudi slavjaščaja tvoego pokrova prazdnik'. (fol. 127r.)

42. . . . tvoim' svjatym' pokrovom' zaščiti knjazja i ljud' ot' vsjakogo zla. (fol. 127r.)

43. Gedeon' tja runo proobraziv [na] tja bo jako rosa Xristos' Bog' snide; k nemu že za ny Bogorodice molisja pobedu podati knjazju na vragy da jako Madiany nizloživ' proslavljaetsja svjatyj tvoj prazdnik'. (fol. 127r.) See Müller, *Des Metropoliten Hilarion*, 74, for Hilarion's citation of the same passage of Judges concerning Gideon.

44. Ukrepi vladyčice slavjaščago tja knjazja na protivnyja vragy jako Davida na Gol'jafa. . . . (fol. 127v.)

45. Fol. 127v.

46. *Ibid.*

47. . . . k' Spasitelju Xristu moljaščjusja podati pobedu knjazju našemu i pogubiti na nas vojujuščix. (fol. 127v.)

48. . . . premeni na radost' našju pečal'. . . . (fol. 128r.)

49. Tebe vsja zemlja dary prinosit' jako cesarice Božiej Materi; cesari i knjazi klanjajut'sja i ljudie vsi veseljat'sja pokryvaemi ot' vsjakogo zla tvoeju Bogorodice molitvoju. (fol. 128r.)

50. Goru tja veliku Danil' napisa ot tebe bo besemene rodisja Xristos'; iskruši vsju bseov'skuju l'st' i vsju svoeja very ispolni zemlju. . . . (fol. 128r.)

51. Fol. 128r., verses v–ix.

52. . . . za ny grešnyja k' Bogu pomolisja tvoego pokrova prazdnik' v Rust'i zemli proslavl'šim. (fol. 128v.)

53. Gordynju i šatanija nizloži i svet' nepravednyx' knjaz' razori . . . i vernomu knjazju rog' v'znesi. . . . (fol. 128v.) (see Ps. 92:10, 112:9).

54. . . . spasi grad i ljudi umnoži i dažd' knjazju sdravie telesi, na poganyja pobedu. . . . (fol. 128v.)

CHAPTER VII

1. This "edition" of the *Life* is included in the thirteenth (or early fourteenth) century *prolog* of the Sinodal'naja Biblioteka, Otdel rukopisej GIM, no. 246, foll. 102–3. The complete text of the copy of this version included in the *Sbornik* of 1558 of the Library of the Soloveckij Monastyr' has been published in "pamjatniki drevne-russkoj duxovnoj pis'mennosti," *Pravoslavnyj sobesednik* (Kazanskaja Duxovnaja Akademija, 1858), part 2, 301–11. See Appendix V.

2. Voronin, "Žitie," 27–28.

3. V. O. Ključevskij, *Drevnerusskie žitija svjatyx kak istoričeskij istočnik* (M., 1871), 10.

4. P.S.R.L. XV, col. 235.

5. Voronin, "Žitie," 27; *Zodčestvo*, 188–92.

6. See Chapter II.

7. For a discussion of the dating and interrelationships of these versions see Ključevskij, *Drevnerusskie žitija*, 3–22; S. A. Bugoslavskij, "Literaturnaja tradicija

v severo-vostočnoj agiografii," *Sbornik statej v čest' Akademika A. I. Sobolevskogo* (L., 1928), 333–34; N. N. Voronin, "Žitie Leontija Rostovskogo i vizantijsko-russkie otnošenija vtoroj poloviny XII v.," *Viz. vrem.* XXIII (1962), 23–26.

8. The earliest version also employs the word *carstvie* in one instance: see Appendix V. I take this to be a Muscovite emendation.

9. See the copy of the fourth redaction published by A. A. Titov, "Žitie svjatogo Leontija episkopa rostovskogo," *Čtenija Obščestva Istorii i Drevnosti Rossijskix* (M., 1893), 1–35.

10. *Ibid.*, 2. See also Voronin, "Žitie," 25. The reference to the Patriarch Photius could derive from the *Lives* of Cyril-Constantine and Methodius.

11. *Paterik*, 6, 102.

12. See Chapters II and IV.

13. *Paterik*, 103.

14. P.S.R.L. I, col. 208.

15. P.S.R.L. XV, col. 166.

16. "Pamjatniki," 437.

17. *Ibid.*

18. P.S.R.L. I, coll. 174–81. For a discussion of the dating of Leontius' episcopacy see Priselkov, *Očerki*, 135–39, and Poppe, *Panstwo i kosiol*, 179–83.

19. See Chapter III.

20. Translated in Cross, 171: "As the bell rang they saw three pillars of fire like rainbows which came and stood over the place where Theodosius was laid. At the same time Stephen (Theodosius' successor) . . . saw across country from his monastery a great light shining over the crypt . . . I dug out a large space . . . and we saw the relics lying there. The members were not separated and the hair of the head still adhered."

21. L. Müller (ed.), "Skazanie o svjatyx mučenikax Borise i Glebe," *Die Altrussischen Hagiographischen Erzählungen und Liturgischen Dichtungen über Die Heiligen Boris und Gleb* (Munich, 1967), 54: "ti videsa čjudo preslav'no: telesi svjatoju nikakoja že ezvy imušči, n' prisno vse celo i liki bjasta svet'le aky angela. . . ."

Bibliography

Abramovic, D. (ed.), *Das Paterikon des Kiever Höhlenklosters*, Repr. 1964.

Adrianova-Peretc, V. P., "O realističeskix tendenciax v drevnerusskoj literature (XI-XV vv.)," *T.O.D.R.L.* XVI, 1-35.

———, "Oblastnye letopisnye svody XI-načale XIII v.," *Istorija russkoj literatury* I. M., L., 1941, 298-314.

Arcixovskij, A. B., *Miniatjury Kenigsbergskoj letopisi.* L., 1932.

Baumgarten, V. de, *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes du X^e^ au XIII^e^ siècles, Orientalia Christiana* IX, no. 35 (1927).

Baynes, N., "The Finding of the Virgin's Robe," *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays.* London, 1955, 240-47.

———, "The Supernatural Defenders of Constantinople," *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays.* London, 1955, 248-59.

Beljaev, I., "Skazanija o načale Moskvy," *Russkij vestnik* (1868), 5-26.

Budovnic, I. Ju., *Obščestvenno-političeskaja mysl' drevnej Rusi.* M., 1960.

Bugoslavskij, S. A., "Literaturnaja tradicija v severo-vostočnoj russkoj agiografii," *Sbornik statej v čest' akademika A. I. Sobolevskogo.* L., 1928, 330-45.

Chalandon, F., *Les Comnènes: Etudes sur l'empire byzantin au XI et au XII siècles.* 2 vols., Paris, 1900-1913.

Cherniavsky, M., *Tsar and People.* New Haven, 1961.

Djakonov, M., *Vlast' moskovskix gosudarej.* St. Petersburg, 1889.

Dobroxotov, V., *Drevnij Bogoljubov': Gorod i monastyr'.* M., 1852.

———, *Pamjatniki drevnosti vo Vladimire Kljazemskom'.* M., 1849.

Fedotov, G. P., *Russian Religious Mind* I: *Kievan Christianity.* Cambridge, Mass., 1946.

Frances, E., "Les relations russo-byzantine au XII^e^ siècle et la domination de Galicie au Bas-Danube," *Byzantinoslavica* XX (1959), 50-62.

Frolow, A., "Le *Znamenie* de Novgorod: Evolution de la légende," *Revue des études slaves* XXIV (1948), 67-81.

———, "Le *Znamenie* de Novgorod: Origines de la légende," *Revue des études slaves* XXV (1949), 45-72.

Georgievskij, G. P., "Russkij li prazdnik Pokrov?," *Čtenija Obščestva Ljubitelej Duxovnogo Prosveščenija.* (Nov. 1893).

Georgjevskij, V., "Svjatyj blagovernyj velikij knjaz' Andrej Bogoljubskij: Ego neocenimyja zaslugi dlja russkogo gosudarstva i pravoslavnoj cerkvi," *Vladimirskija eparxjal'nyja vedomosti,* nos. 18-24 (1896), 427-663.

Golubinskij, *Istorija russkoj cerkvi* I. M., 1901.

Grabar, A., "Images de l'ascension d'Alexandre en Italie et en Russie," *Charisterion eis A. K. Orlandon* I. Athens, 1965, 240-49.

Grekov, B. D., *Kiev Rus'*. Translated by Y. Sdobnikov. M., 1959.
______, *Krest'jane na Rusi*. M., L., 1939.
Grot, K., *Iz istorii Ugrii i slavjanstva v XII veke*. Warsaw, 1889.
Halle, F., *Die Bauplastik von Wladimir-Ssusdal*. Berlin, 1929.
Ipatievskaja Letopis', Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej II. 3rd ed. Petrograd, 1923, repr. 1962.
Istrin, V. M., *Xronika Georgija Amartola v drevnem slavjano-russkom perěvode*. St. Petersburg, 1920.
Janin, V. L., "Knjažeskie znaki suzdal'skix Rjurikovičej," *Kratkie soobščenija Instituta Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury* (1956), 1-16.
Juškov, S. M., *Obščestvenno-političeskij stroj i pravo Kievskogo gosudarstva*. M., 1949.
Ključevskij, V. O., *A History of Russia* I. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. New York, 1911-1912.
______, *Drevnerusskie žitija svjatyx kak istoričeskij istočnik*. M., 1871.
Kondakov, N. P., *Ikonografija Bogomateri* I. St. Petersburg, 1914.
Korsakov, D., *Merja i Rostovskoe knjažestvo*. Kazan, 1872.
Laurent, V., *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin* V, no. 1. Paris, 1963.
Lavrentijskaja Letopis', Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej I. 2nd ed. L., 1926, repr. 1962.
Lazarev, V. N., "Živopis' Vladimiro-Suzdal'skoj Rusi," *Istorija russkogo iskusstva* I. M., 1953, 442-504.
"Letopis' Bogoljubovo Monastyrja s 1158 po 1770 god, sostavlennaja po monastyrskim' aktam' i zapisjam' nastoljatelem' onoj obiteli igumenom' Aristarxom' v 1767-1769 godax," *Čtenija Obščestva Istorii Drevnej Pis'mennosti* (1878), 1-23.
Levčenko, M. V., *Očerki po istorii russko-vizantijskix otnošenij*. M., 1956.
Limonov, Ju. A., *Letopisanie Rostovo-Suzdal'skoj Rusi*. L., 1967.
Lixačev, D. S., *Russkie letopisi*. M., L., 1947.
Ljubavskij, M. K., *Obrazovanie osnovnoj gosudarstvennoj territorii velikorusskoj narodnosti: zaselenie i ob'edinenie centra*. L., 1929.
______, *Russkaja istoričeskaja geografija v svjazi s istoriej kolonizacii*. M., 1909.
Loparev, Xr., "Staroe svedetel'stvo o položenii rizy Bogorodicy vo Vlaxernax v' novom' istolkovanii primenitel'no k' našestviju russkix na Vizantiju v 860 gody," *Viz. vrem.* II (1895), 581-628.
Makarij (Bulgakov), Metropolitan, *Istorija russkoj cerkvi* I, II. St. Petersburg, 1877-1878.
______, *Velikie minei čet'i*, Oct. vol., St. Petersburg, 1870.
Medvedev, E. S., *Drevnerusskaja ikonografija Pokrova*. Dissertacia na učenuju stepen' kandidata iskusstvovedenija. Arxiv Instituta Arxeologii A.N.S.S.S.R. R-2, no. 1728.
Mošin, V., "Russkie na Afone i russko-vizantijskie otnošenija v XI-XII vv.," *Byzantinoslavica* IX (1947-1948), 55-85.
Müller, L. (ed.), *Die Altrussischen Hagiographischen Erzählungen und Liturgischen Dichtungen über Die Heiligen Boris und Gleb*. Munich, 1967.
______, *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede Auf Vladimir den Heiligen und Glaubensbekenntnis*. Wiesbaden, 1962.
Nasonov, A., "Knjaz' i gorod v Rostovo-Suzdal'skoj zemle," *Veka* I (1924), 1-27.

———, "Maloissledovannye voprosy rostovo-suzdal'skogo letopisanija XII veka," *Problemy istočnikovedenija* IX (1961), 349–92.

———, "Ob otnošenii letopisanija perejaslavlja-russkogo k kievskomu (XII v.)," *Problemy istočnikovedenija* VIII (1959), 466–94.

———, *"Russkaja zemlja" i obrazovanie territorii drevnerusskogo gosudarstva.* M., 1951.

Nekrasov, A. I., "Iz suzdal'sko-vladimirskix vpečatlenii," *Sredi kollekcionerov* V–VI (1924), 33–40.

Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov. Edited by A. N. Nasonov. M., L., 1950.

Ostroumov, M. A., "Prazdnik Pokrova Presvjatyja Bogorodicy," *Prixodskoe čtenie* (Oct. 29, 1911), 401–12.

"Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj duxovnoj pis'mennosti," *Pravoslavnyj sobesednik* (Kazanskaja Duxovnaja Akademija) (1858), part 2, 301–11.

Pašuto, V. T., *Očerki po istorii Galicko-Volynskoj Rusi.* M., 1950.

Paterik Kievo-Pečerskogo Monastyrja. Edited by D. Abramovic. *Pamjatniki slavjano-russkoj pis'mennosti.* St. Petersburg, 1908, repr. 1964.

Perfeckij, E. Ju., *Russkie letopisnye svody i ix vzaimootnošenija. Trudy Filosofskogo Fakulteta Universiteta Komenskogo* I, no. 1, Bratislava, 1922.

Pogodin, M. P., *Knjaz' Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij.* M., 1850.

Poppe, A., *Panstwo i kosioł na Rusi w XI wieku.* Warsaw, 1968.

Presnjakov, A. E., *Knjažoe pravo v drevnej Rusi.* St. Petersburg, 1909.

———, *Obrazovanie velikorusskogo gosudarstva.* Petrograd, 1918.

Priselkov, M. D., *Istorija russkogo letopisanija.* L., 1940.

———, *Očerki po cerkovno-političeskoj istorii Kievskoj Rusi X–XII vekov.* St. Petersburg, 1913.

Rasovskij, D., "Rus', černye klobuki i polovcy v 12 v.," *Izvestija na Bulgarskogo Istoričeskogo Družestva* XVI–XVII (1939), 369–78.

Romanov, B. A., *Ljudi i nravy drevnej Rusi: Istoriko-bytovye očerki XI–XIII vv.*. L., 1947.

Roxlin, D. G. and Majkova-Stroganova, V. S., "Rentgeno-antropologičeskoe issledovanie skeleta Andreja Bogoljubskogo," *Problemy istorii dokapitalističeskix obščestv* IX (1935), 155–61.

Rybakov, B. A., "Bojarin-letopisec XII veka," *Istorija SSSR* V (1959), 56–79.

———, *Early Centuries of Russian History.* Translated by John Weir. M., 1965.

Salmina, M. A., *Povesti o načale Moskvy.* M., L., 1964.

Sedel'nikov, A., "Epičeskaja tradicija o Manuile Komnine," *Slavia* III, no. 4 (1925), 606–18.

Serebjanskij, N., *Drevne-russkija knjažeskija žitija.* M., 1915.

Sergij, Archbishop of Vladimir, "Sv. Andrej, Xrista radi Jurodivyj," *Strannik* III (1898), 393–425; 605–50.

Šaxmatov, A. A., *Obozrenie russkix letopisnyx svodov XIV–XVI vv.* M., L., 1939.

Ševčenko, I., "A Neglected Byzantine Source of Muscovite Ideology," *Harvard Slavic Studies* II, Cambridge, (1954), 140–79.

———, "On Some Sources of Prince Svjatoslav's *Izbornik* of the Year 1076," *Orbis scriptus, Festschrift für Dmitrij Tschizewskij zum 70 Geburtstag.* Munich, 1966, 723–38.

______, "Russo-Byzantine Relations After the Eleventh Century," *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (1967), 93–104.

Špilevskij, S. M., *Staryje i novyje goroda i bor'ba meždu nimi v Rostovo-Suzdal'skoj zemle.* Jaroslavl', 1892.

"Skazanie o čudesax vladimirskoj ikony božiej materi," edited with an introduction by V. O. Ključevskij. *Čtenija Obščestva Ljubitelej Drevnej Pis'mennosti* XXX (1878), 1–43.

"Služba na Pokrov," *Pergamennaja Psaltyr'* of the Sinodal'naja Biblioteka, Otdel' Rukopisej Gosudarstvennogo Istoričeskogo Muzeja, otd. III, no. 431, fols. 126v–128v.

Smirnov, A. P., *Volžskie Bulgary.* M., 1951.

Sokolov, P., *Russkij arxierej iz Vizantii i pravo ego naznačenija do načala XV veka.* Kiev, 1913.

Solov'ev, S. M., *Istorija otnošenij meždu russkimi knjaz'ami Rjurikova doma.* M., 1847.

______, *Istorija Rossii s drevnejšix vremen* I. M., 1851, repr. 1959.

______, *Ob otnošenijax' Novgoroda k' velikim' knjaz'jam'.* M., 1846.

Tatiščev, V. N., *Istorija rossijskaja* I, II. 2nd ed. M., 1963–1964.

Titov, A. A., "Žitie svjatogo Leontija episkopa rostovskogo," *Čtenija Obščestva Istorii i Drevnosti Rossiskix.* M., (1893), 1–35.

Tixomirov, M. N., *Drevnerusskie goroda.* M., 1956.

Vagner, G. K., "K voprosu o vladimiro-suzdal'skoj emblematike," *Istoriko-arxeologičeskij sbornik.* M., 1962, 254–64.

______, *Skul'ptura drevnej Rusi XII v.: Vladimir, Bogoljubovo.* M., 1969.

Val'denberg, V., *Drevnerusskie učenija o predelax carskoj vlasti.* Petrograd, 1916.

Vernadsky, C., *Kievan Russia.* New Haven, London, 1948.

______, "Relations byzantino-russes au XII siècle," *Byzantion* IV (1929), 269–75.

Veselovskij, S. B., *Zemlevladenie v severno-vostočnoj Rusi.* M., 1947.

Voronin, N. N., "Andrej Bogoljubskij i Luka Xrizoverg: Iz istorii russko-vizantijskix otnošenij XII v.," *Viz. vrem.* XXI (1962), 29–50.

______, "Arxeologičeskie zametki," *Kratkie soobščenija Instituta Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury.* 1956, 17–32.

______, "Iz istorii russko-vizantijskoj cerkovnoj bor'by XII v.," *Viz. vrem.* XXVI (1965), 190–218.

______, "Literaturnye istočniki v tvorčestve drevnerusskix zodčix," *T.O.D.R.L.* XIII (1957), 367–74.

______, "'Povest' ob Andreja Bogoljubskogo' i ee avtor," *Istorija SSSR* III (1963), 80–97.

______, "Skazanie o pobode nad Bolgarami 1164 g. i prazdnike Spasa," *Problemy obščestvenno-političeskoj istorii Rossii i slavjanskix atran.* M., 1963, 88–92.

______, *Vladimir, Bogoljubovo, Suzdal', Jur'ev-Pol'skoj. Sputnik po gorodam Vladimirskoj Oblasti.* 2nd ed. M., 1965.

______, *Vladimiro-Suzdal'skaja zemlja v X–XIII v. Problemy istorii dokapitalističeskix obščestv.* V–VI (1935).

______, "Žitie Leontija Rostovskogo i vizantijsko-russkie otnošenija vtoroj poloviny XII v.," *Viz. vrem.* XXIII (1963), 23–46.

______, *Zodčestvo severo-vostočnoj Rusi XII–XV vekov.* 2 vols. M., 1961.

Xruščev, I., "O drevnerusskix istoričeskix povestjax i skazanijax XI–XII stoletij," *Universitetskija izvestija* III, part 2, (Kiev, 1878), 225–48.

Zabelin, I. S. "Sledy literaturnogo truda Andreja Bogoljubskogo," *Arxeologičeskie izvestija i zametki* II. (1895), 37–49.

Index

Finito di stampare
nel mese di Dicembre 1980
presso le « a.c. grafiche » di Città di Castello